

# Christian Faith and Life

Combining *The Bible Champion* and *The Essentialist*

Volume 37

APRIL, 1931

Number 4

## EDITORIAL

### A Liberal's Conception of Christ and Salvation Frankly Stated

ONE of the difficult things about Liberalism is that it has steadfastly concealed its true position. Liberals do not want the Church as a whole to know their true position. They state their opinions openly enough in the class rooms; but in the pulpits they are vague and evasive. This program has made the Liberal movement a slow development; but it has also enabled it to penetrate the church quite extensively without rousing it. Laymen widely feel something to be wrong; but it is so indefinite that they are not sure. Such a program when put in cold type is a bit ethically shocking; and many a Liberal has had uncomfortable hours with his conscience because he does not believe what he knows people expect him both to hold and teach.

But we are not interested just now in the ethics or lack of ethics of the Liberal movement, neither are we interested in the inevitable deadening effect of their policy. If they would openly challenge the faith of the Church, believers would defend it; but their policy does not challenge; it ignores or slurs or vaguely denies, and the result is confusion, bewilderment, uncertainty. This has caused a widespread deadening in the Church, people have a sense of unreality and so of half heartedness and of apathy in religious matters. Liberalism is very largely responsible for this; but our interest is not at the present time in this circumstance.

That which interests us is the fact that a liberal has frankly written to a fellow minister of his own denomination, and has unequivocally set forth his position. Here in this letter are its affirmations and its negations. Here we see the so-called new Christianity for what it is,—a system as remote from the faith of the ages as modern cubist art is from the paintings of

Michelangelo. Here is a frank, plain statement of Liberalism,—this is our interest.

The letter came to this magazine from a minister in the middle west. It had been sent to him by its author in response to a letter raising certain interesting theological questions. The correspondence was in fine spirit, and to keep the discussion upon this level we will omit all marks of identification, publishing the letter impersonally as a mere theological opinion.

My dear brother:

I am very happy to meet you in a brotherly spirit, and to attempt to answer your questions; but you must permit me to answer them in my own way and not by proof texts as you suggest. I hope to make my answers Scriptural, meaning, that I hope to make them harmonious to the revelation of God given in the life and teachings of Jesus Christ as contained in the Bible.

1. I believe that the way of salvation is through the saving activity of God, of which the blood of Jesus Christ (I should rather put it, the death of Jesus on the cross) is a symbol, a token, and a measure. I do not believe, however, that the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ either craved or needed blood, either of beasts or of man, to make him either willing or able to save lost men. I do not believe that the God who desires not the sinner's death, but that he repent and live, should desire the death of his sinless Son. I believe that the theories of atonement by the blood of Jesus Christ, as they are commonly held, are contrary to the teach-



ing of Jesus Christ, and foul blasphemy against God. However, I believe that in a different sense the blood of Jesus may be, and often has been, atoning blood (blood at-one-ing man and God). Whenever a sinner has been moved to repentance by the story of the cross, then the blood of Christ, symbolizing both the awfulness of sin and the redeeming love of God, has truly been atoning blood. But not all who have been brought to the blessed assurance of sins forgiven have come by that way. Some came before that story ever was told, as for example, the man to whom Jesus said, "Son, thy sins be forgiven thee."

2. When Napoleon Bonaparte was born, was a great emperor born? Or was the government of France an achievement? The answer must be, Both. I can not give any other answer to your second question, if indeed an answer is possible to a question so ambiguous. However, I am going to try to get at the question in your mind rather than the question as it is worded in your paper.

If the saviourship of Jesus was not a moral achievement, then His life is unmoral, without moral content and value. Then, whatever else He may or may not be, He can not possibly be an example, a pattern for human lives. This seems to me very clear. It seems clear to me that the temptations that came to Him—and we read that He suffered, being tempted, which emphasizes the terrible reality of the temptations—sought to draw Him aside from the path of achievement of saviourship. Had He yielded to them, we would not now have called Him Saviour.

This achievement was the joint-achievement of God and man. God achieved in and through and with Jesus Christ a life which had and has—perhaps I should rather say, which was and is—the power of God unto salvation to those who believe. Decidedly Jesus became the Saviour of the world by achievement.

Was Jesus born Saviour of the world? Certainly not in the sense that he was the saviour of the world before and without the achievement. But in a different sense, I should say He was. Account for it however we will, Jesus must have been fitted from His mother's womb for the achievement. There is a saying, that you can not make a silk purse from a sow's ear. And

while we believe that to God much is possible that seems impossible to man, yet it is not reasonable to believe that in and through and with every human being God could achieve just what He did achieve in and through and with Jesus. If He could, I believe He would. God has limited Himself in regard to His activity wherever human will and nature and initiative is concerned. The infant Jesus made the man Jesus possible; and in that limited sense I believe He was born the Saviour of the world.

3. I base my idea of the plan of salvation—if it is possible to speak of a "plan" of salvation without blasphemy—on the words in which Jesus taught His disciples to address God: "Our Father who is in heaven." Any idea out of harmony with this key-idea of Jesus I dare not admit. But what, then, is the salvation aim of the Father in heaven? Having answered this, we are in a position to ask concerning the method.

The aim of the Father in heaven, as I read it in the Bible, is to restore the prodigal, wayward, sinful child of His to filial relationships involving first of all repentance and faith, and blossoming forth in sympathy and fellowship in thought and work. This restoration can be brought about in one way only. No legal subterfuge, no priestly magic, can bring this about. The change to be wrought must needs be wrought within the heart and mind of the sinner; and once it is wrought, the Father hastens forth to meet His child with love's welcome in divine fulness.

What means does God use to achieve this restoration? Before Jesus came, and now since He has come, God has spoken to men by His Holy Spirit, and through men moved by the Holy Spirit, calling His children away from ways of sin and back to the Father's house. The message was seldom, if ever, clearly understood, much less clearly spoken. Then, as I have before said, God achieved, in Jesus Christ, a clear message. Through the Gospels, we hear the voice of God's Son. May God in mercy forgive those who obscure that message with Jewish legalism and symbolism, making a hiding veil out of that which should form a background for Jesus Christ. I say, Jesus Christ is the living word of God; and through Him, as



through the messengers of Christ, God entreats, "Be ye reconciled!"

But more than a message was needed; for many were so weakened by the power of wrong habits that, even when the truth was perceived, they lacked power to turn and return to God. And this, as I see it, is the crowning triumph in the saving activity of God; in Jesus, God achieved not only a clear message but also a dynamic life—a personality with such winsome power that those who in faith look to him are "saved by a look." That is, as they set Jesus before their eyes, spiritual power sufficient for their need is generated within their own souls. It is not a power that is transmitted from without. It is a moral power generated within themselves through the influence of the dynamic personality of God's Christ.

Such, briefly, is my belief in regard to the aim of God, and the means through which this is brought about. It is all so very simple. May God help us that we may not complicate and obscure this simplicity to ourselves and others.

I have written at considerable length; and I have tried to answer you frankly without evasion. If there still remain points that I have failed to make clear, I shall be glad to reply to whatever other questions you might like to ask.

Yours in the love of Christ,

And now notice several things:—

1. "Scriptural" means the truth contained in the life and teaching of Jesus only. The authoritative Word of God is narrowed down to this small fragment of Biblical material.

2. The death of Jesus Christ is simply a "symbol, a token and a measure." It is definitely not a propitiatory sacrifice. That which has been taught concerning our Lord's redemptive sacrifice is repudiated as "contrary to the teaching of Jesus," a "foul blasphemy against God."

3. The death of Jesus has its effect upon the sinner only and not at all upon the ethical nature of the Triune God. It is a symbol of man's sin and of God's love. This is the force of the words above which speak of the Death of Christ as a "symbol, a token, a measure."

4. But even so, not even in this sense is Christ crucified and risen again the only way of salvation. Some are quickened into moral life by the vision of Christ, and some by a dif-

ferent truth. Of course it will be apparent that the whole idea of salvation is gone. Men are not saved, they are simply stimulated to moral achievement. We hardly need to point out that such a position could be regarded as Scriptural, even in the author's exceedingly narrowed sense, only by persons who are either ignorant of Biblical teaching or else who arbitrarily exclude such passages as do not fit their purpose. As a contrast to this exceedingly diminutive idea of the Cross is that set forth by St. Paul in Romans (chapter 3:25ff), in which all sin, even that which was forgiven before the Son of God became incarnate was forgiven only with reference to this stupendous divine redemption later to be accomplished.

5. It was of course inevitable that the author does not regard Jesus as God the eternal personal Son become incarnate. Such a conception would be very much too large for the small significance given to his Jesus. A human being of extraordinary original endowment, who with divine assistance achieved an unequalled expression of the divine character and motive,—this is all Jesus is. Here again we are in a different world from that of the Scriptures and of the Christian faith. For Christianity the fundamental value in God's redemptive programme is the fact that in the man Christ Jesus very and eternal God has become organically one with the race. Christ is the living God become incarnate, and He is this from the moment of His first infant cry on. Our author's new conception (not new in fact. It is the old monarchian view of Paul of Samosata 260 A. D.) finds in the child Jesus only an interesting baby with more than average possibilities. It is conceivable that He might never have been anything more. As it turned out Jesus did make such very fine choices that with the assistance of God He did at last achieve a moral character so like God's own that it has exemplary and encouraging values for sinful men. In Him, consequently, we both see how bad we are and how good God is. We take heart, are encouraged, do better.

6. The author objects to the idea of a "plan" of salvation. It seems almost blasphemous to him. No plan is necessary. There is nothing to be saved from. The ideas of guilt and judgment and redemption are to him a "legal subterfuge" and "priestly magic." All that is necessary to restore sinful men is for them just to repent and to exercise a kind of faith which blossoms forth in sympathy and fellowship in and through work.



7. The life, death, and resurrection (one questions whether the author believes in the historical resurrection) of Jesus do not mark for this Liberal a stupendous crisis and turning point in God's programme of human salvation. On the contrary both before and since Jesus came God has been saving men simply by calling them to repentance and fellowship. The only difference in New Testament, as compared with Old Testament times is that, now, since Jesus, we have the force of His life and death as a vivid expression of human sin and of divine love. This additional force was necessary because man had become exceedingly weakened by wrong habits, etc. To meet this situation, which had made the Holy Spirit's calling somewhat ineffective, God undertook, and with the fine cooperation of the boy Jesus, succeeded in achieving the one supreme expression of goodness that has occurred in human history. By this achievement He moves us to repentance on the one hand and inspires us to high endeavor on the other.

No wonder our author thinks it is blasphemy to call this a plan. We agree with him, especially if anything so superficial is to be attributed to the infinite God. Men do not need the example of Jesus to know how sinful they are. David knew it a thousand years before Christ came. Isaiah knew it. Plato knew it. Seneca knew it. The fact is man's sinfulness is so widely known that it is one of the universally admitted truths. And the isolated life of Jesus does not prove that every man can live that way: for the author admits that there was some extraordinary capacity in Jesus that made it possible for God with His cooperation to achieve, the moral beauty of His isolated life. We know we are sinful without Jesus' cross: and we know we cannot live as Jesus lived since it was some extraordinary equipment that made that life possible for Him,—where then is the saving power? The fact is the Liberal Jesus has none. Liberal Christianity is simply a confusion of ideas that will not mix. A graduate of Chicago University once put it this way: "The thing that makes the uniqueness of Jesus so precious to me is that in point of equipment He was exactly like all the rest of us." Fine! but how then explain His absolute uniqueness? If He was sufficiently unique for it to be significant, that uniqueness must be explained by an extraordinary start and equipment. But if He had an extraordinary start and equipment, then His life has little value as our encouragement

and example. If you make Him simply human and no more, He ceases to be historical. If you admit some unique element in Him that is nowhere else seen, then you make Him supernatural.

Once Christ is admittedly supernatural the Liberal's idea of His significance is lost; and their whole contention becomes intellectually worthless: for if the supernatural is admitted in principle the place of it and the character of it and the amount of it is evidently a discussion for history and not a matter for theological dogmatizing.

But finally, this is our only point: This liberal Christ with its impoverished cross, its depleted Scripture and its amiable but ethically aenemic God is not Christianity. For the Christian centuries sin is something dreadful. It is something that has done such frightful violation to the moral nature of the Holy Trinity that He cannot tolerate it for a moment; and yet in love and pity He cannot surrender man, His creature, made in His own image, to doom. He purposes salvation. His plan is older than creation. It involves priest and prophet and a redeemer nation.

At last in the fullness of time all prophecies and types were fulfilled and He, the living God, God the eternal Son, put aside His glory and ensheathed Himself in the flesh and nature of Mary's virgin born Son. He became one with our race. He took its guilt and judgment up into His own infinite life. He bore death with us and for us that He might, in His Cross, speak a word of moral judgment that would make the very ages tremble; and that He might also offer an uttermost salvation to every poor trembling guilty life that would yield itself, in humility and faith and trust, to Him.

From that epochal point of man's self yielding salvation is all divine grace and Almighty power. We are justified by His redemption, we are sanctified by His creative Spirit, we are glorified by the very omnipotence of God which wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead and seated Him at His own right hand. For the Christian faith this is the power that works in us who believe; and our destiny is nothing less than a place beside our Divine Lord upon His Throne,—*"Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me: that thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world"* (John 17:24).—*H.P.S.*



## A Church makes Christian Protest

**U**NDER the date of February 2, 1931, the Bigspring Methodist Episcopal Church made formal protest against the violation of the law and constitution of the Church by its officers, ministers and teachers. The resolutions are a lay action, and were passed notwithstanding the strong disapproval of the presiding officer, who was the minister of the Church. We are reprinting the resolutions:

Realizing that Christians and the church should exercise patience and love toward all men and especially toward those who, because of ignorance or lack of proper environment or study, hold wrong views or beliefs regarding the Bible and God's plan of salvation, yet the truth must never be compromised to suit the selfish ambitions of false or misguided people either among the laity or leadership of the church:

Therefore, be it Resolved, that we, the Official Board or local governing body of the Bigspring Methodist Episcopal Church, protest against and seriously object to those having official authority over us sending into our church teachers and ministers or other leaders who are not in harmony with all the articles of faith of the Methodist Episcopal Church as given under that head in the Discipline, or those who are neutral toward, or compromise with, or believe in what is popularly known as Evolution or Modernism.

Resolved further: That we do not feel obligated to give moral or financial support to such teachers, ministers or other persons in official positions over us.

Resolutions passed by the Official Board of Bigspring Methodist Episcopal Church.

*Cleveland, Tennessee, February 2, 1931.*

This is one more protest against the continuance of a situation that is wrong. These protests will multiply as more and more the laity begin to realize what is going on. One is sorry the resolution stands evolution beside Modernism. Evolution is a scientific speculation. Modernism is a theological infidelity. There may or may not be a relation between these two ideas; but the formal criticism by these official brethren of Methodism properly should deal with theological infidelity and not with what may or may not be its cause.

But here is another Christian protest. Back in the fifties men thought slavery protests would pass. We now know they did not. Nor will these protests against theological infidelity in the Protestant Church pass. Protestant Christianity is passing through a very difficult experience. It is difficult for Evangelicals, and doubtless equally difficult for Modernists. One is sure Modernists must be galled by the untruth, the bad faith, the compromises into which they find themselves constantly forced.

To lead in recitation of creeds one does not believe, and try to keep one's self-respect by becoming silent at a point; to be the minister of a congregation, and know that one dare not express frankly and fully what one truly believes; to use a ritual, sing hymns, and administer sacraments which express a point of view remote from that which one actually holds; to sit in ecclesiastical bodies and take part in the adoption of declarations which are repugnant (or if one does not actually vote for the declarations, at least to sit silently by while they are voted); to live year after year with the feeling that one's position is equivocal, and less than high class,—this is the galling pain of the Modernist in every one of the confessional Churches.

The Evangelical's position is equally painful. He is doomed to a continually reducing confidence in the overhead of his Church. He sees he would like to face them courageously, even sacrificially; but it is impossible. If it is an educational campaign, he may know that the school in question is negative and anti-Christian. If it is some other benevolence there are almost certain to be other questions. If he listens to addresses in great Church gatherings he inevitably notices the absence of the essential emphases. The man who speaks may be an exponent of the historic faith, but he has been brought to feel that it is politic to omit certain ideas for the sake of unity. The number of these omitted ideas continually increases until the authority of Scripture, the virgin birth, the atonement, the resurrection, and even the Deity of Christ are now all passed by. The Evangelical feels impotent, shut in, wronged, violated. His heart is more sore than that of a patriot whose country's liberties are being crushed under the feet of foreign soldiers.

**W**HAT is the solution of this utterly ruinous situation? The Modernist is being injured in his spiritual life, his sincerity, his character. The Evangelical is being injured in his passion, in his stride of victory. The Gospel is being defeated. Modernism cannot win. It conceivably can destroy Protestant Christianity; but it can never vitalize and lead it. Evangelical faith can only win by the actual conversion of the Modernists. One does not mean to be offensive; but when Jesus Christ is reduced to the son of Joseph and Mary who achieved a certain character; when His cross is



reduced to a mere martyrdom; when His historical triumph over the grave is denied; and when salvation is changed from a stupendous supernatural work of redemptive and creative grace into man's own self made character, it must be perfectly evident that those who are the exponents of such a view cannot be converted men in the Christian sense.

One of three things must happen: There must be a sweeping revival of religion that will bury Modernism as the Wesleyan revival buried English Deism (the Modernism of that time); or there must be a voluntary division within the great Protestant Christian communions, ministers with their congregations and church buildings being allowed to retire from their denominational groups, and to federate themselves into a new Unitarian communion (which is precisely what Modernism is); or Protestant Christianity will be progressively

weakened until certain great branches will die before our eyes as the Unitarian branch of New England Congregationalism is now dying.

Modernists and Evangelical Christians can no better work together in the same Christian organization than Buddhists and Christians can. The decline of membership and the failure to advance which is widely true in American Protestantism is due to the spread of unbelief; and there can be no effective spiritual advance until the impossible confusion within them is corrected. It is doubtless a serious thing to go to the hospital for a major operation; but it is a more serious thing to die because one has not gone. And what is true of the individual is true of the Church. The Church is an organism, and Modernism is a destructive growth adhering to its body. It must be cut off, or Protestant Christianity itself will inevitably decay.—H.P.S.

## Without Compromise

**I**N THE first chapter of the book of Judges, at the twenty-eighth verse we read, "And it came to pass, when Israel was strong, that they put the Canaanites to tribute, and did not utterly drive them out."

Like a phrase in music, recurring again and again, in a sort of haunting way, we find running all through the Bible, condemnation of compromisers. The one thing that God can not and does not abide is the seemingly faultless nobody.

### HALF WAY MEASURES MEAN SURRENDER

People who try to be on good terms with everybody and everything, with good and evil at the same time; who are trying to walk with Christ while they are coquetting with Satan; who are seeking in some way to get the approbation of God when they are walking in paths which He has forbidden have no favor with God. The demand for a courageous determination and a firm stand upon all moral issues is persistently presented in God's Word.

God had given His command definitely, unequivocally, to exterminate the Canaanites. Why? They had become so imbued with their idolatry which was full of iniquity, so saturated and permeated with the things of the world, that they were encumbrances on the land with no prospect of change; being such an encumbrance God desired to supplant them with a people who recognized His commandments and also His Law and who were determined what-

ever the loss to maintain to the full, His holy will.

But when the Israelites became strong, "They put the Canaanites to tribute and did not utterly drive them out." They permitted them to pay tribute, instead of eliminating them with the result that ultimately they suffered all sorts of indignity from those whom they had permitted to remain, but whom God had told them to drive out and eliminate. They were always a thorn in the flesh. They were continually injuring the people of Israel. There is a great lesson here for us. When in the time of Tertullian people said, "The requirements of the Gospel are too severe" the answer was, "You can't serve God on condition. Your service must be unconditional service."

### THINGS THAT WILL NOT COMBINE

Things entirely dissimilar will not assimilate. The Canaanites and the Israelites could never have assimilated. They stand as an example and an illustration and a powerful proof of this great truth that light can not abide where there is darkness; neither darkness where there is light, for the things that are as dissimilar as right and wrong, truth and error, will never, never combine. You simply can not be half and half though you try to be. In trying so to be you always live the life of nobodies in the world, drifting and never driving, slipping and sliding but never ascending.

This is the thing that is protested against in



the Word of God. Had they carried out the Commandment of God and eliminated the Canaanites the history of Israel would have been entirely different; changed completely. If every Christian entirely eliminated the Canaanites from his heart and soul, what transformations we would see in character! A little seed dropped upon a rock brings forth no bloom. Why? It has nothing to live on. It can not assimilate the hard rock. It must be in good soil calculated to produce growth.

Jesus speaks of the leaven in the meal, but not of the leaven in the sand. Leaven placed in the sand produces no results. There is nothing it can assimilate. Leaven in the meal finds that which it can assimilate and so it does produce results. Good and evil are mutually antagonistic. Christ and Belial can never have any part with one another. Virtue and villainess exclude each other. Christianity and worldliness will never combine.

Leigh Hunt said, "The most astounding thing to contemplate in the world is the paucity of Christian power when we consider the number of professing Christians." Why? Evidently because there has been no disposition to exterminate the Canaanites. Our religion is too readily a religion of conditions. If it is not difficult, then we will perform our religious duties; ceremonies at least.

Now many a person there is who takes account of his own condition and says, "How glorious was the time when I did believe in God; when I knew Him; when I did walk with Christ. It was no figment of the imagination. I did walk with Him. How splendid it was when I opened the Word of God and read it and knew that God was speaking to me. And how has it come about that today no such sense of zeal and enthusiasm obtains? Why is it that my life at the present time is lacking in those enthusiasms which are commanded in God's Word and is all too much permeated with those dissipations which are everywhere condemned?" It is because the Canaanites were not exterminated.

#### WHEN THEY BECAME STRONG

"When Israel became strong!" And there is a whole volume of truth in that for us today. We regard our Christianity as a Christianity for extremities, crises, rather than a Christianity for daily circumstances something which we can use when the time comes when we have to call on, perhaps need to have, a supernatural power, but the fact is, we need a supernatural power all the way along.

In the many difficult duties of life we need the supernatural, because we need guidance which is greater than human guidance can be and we need a vision which becomes ours only when the great Oculist and Optician Himself has dealt with us and opened our eyes to see the things which are invisible to the natural eye. We need it so much. But we regard our Christianity as only important for the hour of death. But Jesus regarded it as transcendently important for the conduct of life.

We would not hesitate one moment in saying, "Oh of course I know in the time of a great extremity I will call upon the Lord," just as Jonah called upon the Lord when the ship was sinking. He made his confession and was cast out. But as a matter of fact, our Christianity is designed for the pleasant experiences as much as for the time when the storm is on. Our growth, if we grow at all, will not be so much when the stress of storm is on. It will be when we have an opportunity to think; when calm contemplations of Him are possible; in conditions favorable, when we can assimilate things that are in the soil, calculated to produce growth and strength, vision and beauty.

Why is it we have so many misgivings, doubts and misinterpretations? Because we have become strong in our own estimation. Because things are moving on comfortably well. We are able to take our place in the Church, move in pretty good society, well-clothed, comfortably surrounded, no extreme need manifesting itself! We have no particular fear of tomorrow. We have made provision against tomorrow and so we are rather content with the world and think we have in ourselves a good deal that is commendable. When Israel became strong, they "Put the Canaanites to tribute."

During the time in Hebrew history of the subjection and conquest, the "stars in their courses fought against Sisera." In the time of extreme need, when it seemed as though victory would not perch upon their banners, they called upon God in humiliation. But when Israel became strong, "They put the Canaanites to tribute and did not drive them out." We have a feeling somehow, because we have a good deal of fundamental knowledge and power to accomplish things that it is not so necessary for us to call upon God in the morning and ask His guidance during the day. We will meet the temptation, the defiling temptations, we will meet naturally and overcome them without calling upon anybody.



And there is altogether too much encouragement for this apostate attitude, too much declaration that a man would be foolish to suppose he needs anything outside of himself. Poor, weak, flabby, humanity, ignorant of itself, when it takes that attitude! As a matter of fact, "one man becomes a thousand and two put ten thousand to flight" immediately when calling upon God in Christ they undertake some supreme task in life.

When Christ was called upon for any act by the Father, He sprang to His Feet. His was an illustrious life. There were no excuses in His life. Immediately when the voice came to Him, even though it was the Cross, He sprang forward. His response was instant. His was an unequivocal life. His was an enthusiastic life. And there is no possible encouragement either in the New Testament or in the Old for the appeal which is made in some Universities today to eliminate as far as you possibly can every heart element from your nature. As though it were possible for a person by mere intellect to come to any understanding with himself or with the Eternal God.

The whole man, the entire personality is involved when we are weighing and measuring what purports to be truth. Jesus asks us to allow our enthusiasms full play. As the sunshine floods the world, so let the light of the love of our souls flood the areas about us with blessing and with benefit. God expects us, though we become strong, to recognize that strength is a gift and a trust, that it is weakness itself if we do not still attach ourselves to Deity. And how miserable and how wretched is the person who finds himself all at once tripped up, trapped by some seducing influence, listening to strange, siren voices which woo him away from duty until he discovers himself going down, down, down.

We urge, therefore, the extermination of the Canaanites from the soul; those representations in magazines, in books, in public addresses of popular pirates; in the movies which are so filled with the salacious and the iniquitous. We dare not allow ourselves to revel in the things which are Canaanitish in their character.

#### COMPROMISES IN MATTERS OF FAITH

In nothing is compromise more disastrous than in matters of faith. Today there is a persistent effort made to minimize the significance of religious belief. This is manifest in a great many ways, but very particularly in the attempt to federate everything that goes under the name of religion.

Christianity can no more amalgamate with the idolatries of today, than could the religion of Judaism amalgamate with the paganism represented by the Canaanites. Just as they got into all kinds of trouble in their minimizing of God's commandments and what was known as the "Faith in Israel," so today the Christian Church is steadily losing power and is unable to make any effective impression on the world because of the disposition to compromise with all forms of unbelief. Whatever else it may be, rationalistic Modernism is not Christianity—in reality there is no other worthy of consideration—which can no more mix with extreme Modernism, than you can mix light and darkness or fuse together gold and wood.

The Israelites put the Canaanites to tribute and did not eliminate them. We are doing precisely the same thing in a different way. We are calling upon Modernism for co-operation, and subordinating our convictions for the sake of a temporary peace. One article of belief after another is set aside, because it is declared to be interesting, but not important, until the Church finds itself without a definite body of religious belief. The idea of authority is completely repudiated.

A recently published sermon from a man occupying a very prominent Congregational pulpit makes a clear declaration that intelligent people no longer concern themselves much with the supernatural and as for the Person of Jesus, they recognize that He was a man like other men, sharing the errors of his day and by no means always right even in spiritual matters. This is the rankest kind of heresy and any general acceptance of such a position would doom the Christian Church to speedy dissolution.

If ever the Scripture warning to have nothing to do with the unfruitful works of darkness should be applied it is today. There is no middle ground between truth and error in matters of Christian Faith. The Bible is not half true and half false. Jesus Christ Himself was not in His Personality half wrong and half right. The whole Christian Scripture is immediately repudiated when the Virgin Birth and the Vicarious Sacrifice of Jesus are thrown into the discard.

It is a great mistake for Evangelicals to compromise with Modernism or in other words to put Modernism to tribute. A complete elimination of the gross errors and rampant unbelief which appear at every turn in rationalistic liberalism is the pre-requisite of a recovery of lost power with God.



If we are ever again to be able to say to the dead, "Come forth" or to the paralytic, "Rise up and walk" or to the soul dead in trespasses and sin, "Thy sins are forgiven," it will be because with true devotion to the Gospel of the Son of God, and the hearty and unequivocal acceptance of Jesus Christ as He is presented to us in the Gospels we courageously undertake world evangelization and receive power from on High through the Divine inbreathing of the Holy Spirit.

We are afraid of criticism and so we compromise. We want to be "Good fellows" and find it difficult to stand firmly for what we know to be right and true and so we yield position after position to the enemy. A soft and flabby sentimentalism causes us to prefer peace to honor. The great ventures of faith never stop to ask whether the course will be popular or whether it will bring about a transient peace. Such ventures ask only one question, "Is it right and is it God's will?"—A.Z.C.

## What Christians Should Believe

CHRISTIANS should believe in the plenary inspiration of the Canonical Scriptures. "All Scripture is God-breathed," etc. (2 Tim. 3:16); "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Pet. 1:21). If this could be said by inspired apostles of the Old Testament, it can also be said of the New Testament, which everywhere professes to give the complete revelation of God's plan of redeeming love and grace through Jesus Christ. That spells plenary inspiration. If the Bible is not fully inspired, who is competent to tell us just what is and what is not inspired?

Christians should believe in God, and in only one God—monotheism. "Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord" (Deut. 6:4; Mark 12:29). "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve."

Christians should believe that, while there is only one God, He is the triune God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Again and again the Scripture indicate both oneness and threeness in the Godhead. Divine names, attributes, works and worship are ascribed to all three persons, which ought to be enough proof for the Biblically begotten Christian that the three persons are divine.

Christians should believe in the true deity and humanity of Jesus Christ. "In the beginning was the Word, and that Word was with God, and the Word was God. . . And the Word became flesh" (John 1:1,14). "His name shall be called Emmanuel, which means God with us" (Matt. 1:23). But He was also true man. He had all the truly human attributes; for sin is not a real part of man's true nature as it originally came from the creating and fashioning hand of God. So Christ is known as the divine-human Saviour of the world—human,

so that He might suffer on the cross for us; divine, so that He might give infinite value to His atoning sacrifice.

Christians ought to believe in the Virgin Birth of Christ. The angel of the Annunciation appeared to the Virgin Mary, and said to her: "And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call His name Jesus" (Luke 1:31). Matthew bears the same testimony. If Christ had been naturally generated, He would have been a human person, not the divine Son of God incarnate. How could a human person have made expiation for the sins of the whole world?

The true Christian ought and will believe in the substitutionary atonement that Christ wrought for mankind. "For He hath made Him who knew no sin to be sin for us; that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him" (2 Cor. 5:21). "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God" (1 Pet. 3:18). "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us" (Gal. 3:13). The Son of Man came to "give His life a ransom for many" (Matt. 20:28). "He was wounded for our transgressions; (Isa. 53:5).

There are many other holy truths which the Christian will and ought to believe, but we will mention only one more, as it would be impossible to make the catalogue complete. The Christian will believe in the glorious and visible second coming of our Lord—what is known as the Parousia. "When the Son of Man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit upon the throne of His glory; and before Him shall be gathered all nations" (Matt. 25:31, 32; cf. Matt. 24:30; 26:64; Mark 13:26; 14:62).

The true Christian does not have a meager faith. He wants to believe and experience as much truth as God in His goodness is willing to give him.—L.S.K.



# Current Religious Thought

## Comments on Current Religious Thought

PROFESSOR LEANDER S. KEYSER, A.M., D.D.

### Life a Dirge for the Agnostic

In *Who's Who in America* Joseph Wood Krutch is denominated an agnostic. He is the author of a number of books, among them *Our Changing Morals* and *The Modern Temper*. In the second book he bewails "the bleak and arid despair which is settling over the minds of the moderns." Charles Richet of France, who recently won the Nobel prize for physiology, is "a great man of science," but an agnostic. He bemoans the fact that man is chained down to this paltry mass of gas, stone and mud, the earth. He weeps because men cannot escape oblivion; because only one out of a hundred million is remembered by posterity; because of the afflictions of the body and the aging of the soul; because a passing planet or comet may shatter the earth; because men cannot decree what their children should be. The great questions of the mind cannot be answered, he says. These questions are: Whence came man and whither is he bound? Why is man? Why are stars, and solar systems, and evolution? Why is anything? Do you see what agnosticism leads to? What is the antidote for all this sobbing pessimism and sadness? The teaching of the Bible: "All things work together for good to them that love God, to them that are the called according to His purpose."

### Abnormal Psychology

In consideration of the vast amount of bad psychology that is advocated today, a brisk writer gives us the following apt apothem: "The psychology of the abnormal is assumed to be the norm for the normal." Then he continues: "The psychic evils of morbid inhibitions are arguments employed against self-restraint in sexual life and in behalf of moral temperamentism. Men use a new terminology and believe themselves to be masters of new truth. There is nothing new in these undisciplined appetites of men under whatever pretexts they may proclaim themselves. They offer no new recipe for human happiness. They

lead inevitably to spiritual degeneration and social disaster." The writer is speaking of the lax ideas of marriage and the sex relations. Let his admonitions be heeded.

### The Inspiration of Faith in God

In these times of mental ferment and turbulence the following statement is too good to keep from our readers: "But give man the faith that he dwells in a universe where God is, where personality reigns, in which all things are linked together by one divine purpose, and that he, frail though he be, is yet co-operating in the glorious unfoldment of that purpose, and, behold, what a current of hope and confidence is sent into his life! With such a faith no man can be utterly lonely or lost. The consciousness of God will be like the presence of a mighty kinsman, a friend, by his side."

### Unchanging Truth

An advertisement of Dr. James H. Snowden's recently issued book, *What Do Present-Day Christians Believe?* has this to say of the book: "The general position assumed is that religious truth is a growing body of knowledge and experience, and that such progress is to be expected and welcomed and worked for, as the means of ever wider and richer spiritual life." We hold that this is not an accurate statement. Truth is not a changing or growing thing. Truth *per se* is ever the same. It is men's apprehension of the truth that changes and may be either progressive or retrogressive.

### Let us be Consistent

Of course, Dr. Snowden, above referred to, is well known as a liberalist in theology, with lax views of the inspiration of the Bible, as we know from some of his previous volumes, and so we hardly expect him to make an adequate statement regarding religious truth. In the preface to the book now in question he says that "the title of the book implies that what Christians believe today differs from what they believed yesterday." But note, the concluding



sentence of this same preface is as follows: "Yet the foundation principles of our religious faith and life abide unchanged, and our Lord Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, today and forever." The trouble is, far too often a liberalist's declarations point now this way, now that way, just as do the statements just quoted. Besides let us think more clearly: Are only the foundation principles of our religion true and immutable, while the superstructure which is built upon them is weak and transitory. Suppose that a house were built on a solid foundation, and yet the doors and windows and roof were removed, how could we live in the building on cold winter days? Brethren, let us think more seriously and consistently.

### What was Paul's Doctrine?

Well, he was not one-sided. He did not have a "this way and that way" faith, which was tossed about with every wind of the passing age and variable *Zeitgeist*. His was not a chameleon religion. He laid due emphasis on the foundation, saying: "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." But, mind you, he did not stop there, as if that was enough. No! In the preceding verse he said: "I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon; but let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon." And in the succeeding verse he exhorts his readers to use good material in building on the foundation, so that the whole structure will stand the test of the fire of the judgment day. It is very weak thinking to suppose that, if only the foundation is solid and perduring, any kind of a superstructure can be built upon it.

### Sinful Silence

A writer in one of our contemporaries uses the above alliterative caption for his article. It is a good piece indeed. We need not quote from it, but desire to add some reflections. There may be times—indeed, there *are* times—when it may well be said that "silence is golden." It may not always be easy to know just when to speak—or even when to keep the ink in your bottle or on your typewriter ribbon. But surely there are many times, too, when it is a mark of weakness, compromise and cowardice to keep silent. Our Lord taught this truth when He said to His disciples, "Ye are my witnesses." He did not bid them to bear witness merely when it was easy and popular to do so, but also when it was unpopular and when persecution might follow. From the

very beginning, the Christian cause has been advanced and souls have been won for Christ chiefly through the unequivocal testimony of Christ's disciples. Today we should not hide our light under a bushel, but set it out where it can be seen.

### The Babylonian Epic of Creation

Dr. Theophilus G. Pinches, the well-known archeologist, contributed an article to *The Bible Witness*, published in England, in the January number. He quotes parts of the Babylonian Epic of Creation. Any one can see from these citations that it would have been impossible for the writer of Genesis I to borrow from this paganish story. We give a few samples: "When on high the heavens were unnamed; beneath, too, no abode recorded a name; Apsu then, the primeval, was their producer; the element Tiawath was the bearer of them all. When none of the gods had been produced; a name was not recorded, the fates had not been fixed; then were created the gods within them; Lahmu-Lahamu were produced; by name they were announced." Now, kindly reader, how does such a mythological story agree with the account of the creation in Genesis? The latter mentions none of these heathen gods—not one of them. Besides, the gods were "produced" and "created." Compare this mythological and polytheistic account with the simple and sane record of Genesis, which begins by saying, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." The Biblical writer could not have borrowed from such a paganish story, and then have rinsed it from all its paganish elements. It is much more reasonable to believe that Genesis gives the true and inspired account of the creation, while the Babylonian story is a later recension and corruption.

### More of the Babylonian Story

It will be helpful to the evangelical believer to read another quotation from the Babylonian legend, so that he may see the vast difference between pagan mythology and Biblical history. The Babylonian writer is speaking of the gods, Lahmu and Lahamu, named in the preceding paragraph. Then he says of these pagan divinities: "For ages they grew up, they flourished. Ansar-Kisar were created even greater than they. The days grew long, the years increased. Anu, their son, was the rival of his fathers. Ansar then made Anu, and his first born, equal, and Anu begat Nudimmud in his likeness." Does that sound anything like the beautiful



monotheistic record in Genesis? The difference is a polar difference. Genesis is divinely inspired. The other is purely ethnic.

### What Says the Legal Mind?

According to the February number of the *Bible Witness* (which has come to hand since the foregoing paragraph was written), the late Sir Robert Anderson contended that, in the light of the law of evidence, the Bible account of creation could by no means be derived from the legends of Babylonia, as claimed by the Modernists, but is stamped with the marks of divine inspiration. According to the said legend, Tiawath was "the sea as the first crude creator" (Pinches). Her spouse was Apsu, and their son was Mummu. Apsu was killed by "their perfect and evolved offspring." Tiawath did not know of her husband's death for a while, but when the information reached her, "bitterly she wept, and sat down wailing." Then vengeance was sworn by some of the gods. Could the writer of Gen. I have borrowed from such a mythological source? The answer is an emphatic, No!

### True Marriage

In these days of lax views of the marital relation, it is good to listen to the clarion voice of Dr. W. Graham Scroggie, of Edinburgh, as he discourses in his recent book on *St. John*. In commenting on our Lord's presence at the wedding in Cana of Galilee, Dr. Scroggie has this to say: "A Christless wedding is a failure from the start. People who get married without the Master are asking for trouble. There are two things which God is against, and He is against all who practice them, namely, celibacy and polygamy. God's law is, remain single, or marry one woman and remain loyal to her." No place for "trial" marriage in such advice.

### A Scientific Theist

It does us good to quote the following paragraph from Arthur H. Compton, Professor of Physics in the University of Chicago and winner of the Nobel prize in 1930: "When you ask what will happen to you after death, you are concerned, not with your body, but with your consciousness, mind, or soul, however you may choose to name it. If we must know the fate of consciousness when the body dies, we must know the relation between body and mind. Speaking as man to man and not as a scientist, how can a father who loves his children choose to have them die? As long as there is in heaven

a God of love, there must be for His children everlasting life." Here is a scientist who feels and knows that the soul of man cannot be satisfied with merely a little slice of time, and then, when it is over, drop into eternal oblivion.

### And now about Theology

As a rule, we rejoice in the many salient things that Roger W. Babson has to say about the need of religion and spiritual experience. However, every now and then he says things that evangelical Christians cannot approve, and we are sorry for it. Recently he made this statement: "Whatever your theology may be, or even if you discard all theology, you surely believe in spiritual power and that such power has great possibilities." Now, that is wrong and inconsistent. Mr. Babson himself recognizes God, and must have some idea of God as "spiritual power," and that means theology. It may be a very defective kind of theology, but it is theology, nevertheless. One might say that a man does not need to master a whole system of scientific theology in order to be saved, and in order to be a good Christian; but that does not mean that we should disparage scientific theology. A man might love flowers without knowing much about botany, but that does not mean that the science of flowers and plants is not valuable. So with theology. And, besides, a knowledge of evangelical theology ought to increase one's appreciation of the Christian system of truth and salvation, and lead to deeper spirituality.

### Theology and the Spiritual Mind

We confess that we cannot understand how a scholarly man can study the Christian system and world-view without having the spiritual mind. Surely the more a person knows about the love of God, the more he ought to love Him in return. A study of the incarnation of the Son of God and His loving sacrifice in man's behalf for sin, surely ought to stir responding love in the heart of the investigator. When one studies the gracious work of the Holy Spirit in vocation, regeneration and sanctification, how can one help becoming more and more spiritually minded? How any can have a mere academic and intellectual interest in evangelical theology is a psychological puzzle that we cannot unravel. We do not believe that there are many scholars of that kind. At all events, the writer can bear witness that the great treatises on evangelical theology which he has in his library all give proof that their authors have the spiritual mind, or, if they have



passed on into heaven, they had the spiritual mind while they were living and writing.

### The Bible's Two Three-Sixteens

We borrow a thought from the *Sunday School Times*, which is a powerful exponent of the evangelical faith. The *Times* also borrows from Dr. W. P. White, President of the Bible Institute of Los Angeles. There are two Three-Sixteens in the Bible—John 3:16 and 2 Tim. 3:16. They agree and corroborate each other. If 2 Tim. 3:16 is not true, then we can have no assurance of the truth of John 3:16, and we are sailing on an uncharted sea without a compass and a guiding star. On the other hand, if 2 Tim 3:16 is true, as we certainly believe it to be, then we may lay our whole weight on John 3:16, announcing to us the almighty and saving love of God through the incarnate and atoning Son. Say, that is enough to make even a quiet Christian say Hallelujah!

### When a Nobel Prize is not Noble

As our readers doubtless know, the Nobel prize for literature was awarded to Sinclair Lewis, the author of *Main Street*, *Babbitt* and *Elmer Gantry*. In his *Main Street* he gives a very one-sided and pessimistic picture of the American town, representing it as if that status were typical. In *Elmer Gantry* the conception of the minister of the gospel is likewise distorted. The *Sunday School Times* also tells us that Henry Van Dyke has declared that Sweden's act "is a back-handed compliment to America"—which we interpret to mean a slam rather than a compliment. A keen writer in the *Watchman-Examiner*, New York, writes as follows: "At present Sinclair Lewis and other writers who lack spiritual imagination and moral enthusiasm are in the ascendent. . . . They poison public taste. But the epoch of these toadstool cultivators in fiction will pass. Some day, perhaps in our lifetime, perhaps later, an American writer of great spiritual and artistic distinction will put his stamp on our literature. He will inspire other writers and elevate national taste." Then "the output of the cynics of this era will look like the mold-fungus that covers mental decay."

### What is the Word of the Lord?

"But the Word of the Lord endureth forever. And this is the Word which by the Gospel is preached unto you" (1 Pet. 1:25). This is a significant statement. Dubious people wonder what is the Word of the Lord and where it is

to be found. Can we rightly say that "the Word of the Lord" which "endureth for ever" is the Bible? Our reply is, If we do not find it in the Bible, where is it? Then it has been lost, and we are all at sea, drifting we know not whither. But we must use better logic than that. We must think more deeply and more spiritually. Peter says that the Word is "the gospel which is preached unto you." He gives evidently a portion of the Word in his epistles and in the sermon which he preached on the day of Pentecost and at various other times. Now, if you can believe what Peter said and wrote to be the "Word of the Lord," you will find every vital element of the gospel preached in those parts of the Bible, and they bear testimony to the divine inspiration of the Old Testament (2 Pet. 1:19-21), to the veracity of the apostolic witness (2 Pet. 1:15-18), and to the writings of Paul (2 Pet. 3:15, 16). Note that in the last verses cited Peter speaks of "all" Paul's epistles and aligns them with "the other Scriptures." Since "the Word of the Lord" is the Bible, we have a sure guide for the present life and sure promise of the life to come. These facts stir another Hallelujah in the believing soul.

### The Real Cause of Wicked Hatred

Our contemporary, the *Sunday School Times*, gives such a keenly analytical expose of the unreasonableness of hatred of Christ from Canon Liddon's *Passiontide Sermons* that we will not withhold it from our readers. He is replying to the question, why some people hate Christ, and says: "Ask why it is that the light, which gladdens nature, which invigorates healthy life, is torture to a diseased eyesight? It is not that the light is less beneficent, but the organ is diseased, and therefore the light brings irritation, discomfort, pain, and no effort is too great to escape it. The light of lofty sanctity is just as painful to diseased souls; in its highest and perfect form as manifested in Jesus, it goads them to madness." This diagnosis, much as it may hurt, is true. In another phrasing, the apostle said the same thing long ago: "The carnal mind is enmity against God" (Rom. 8:7).

### The Recapitulation Theory

The January-March number of the *Bible League Quarterly* (see our Book Review Department) contains a convincing article by H. M. Messenger on the evolution theory, showing how far short it comes from having a truly scientific basis. On the so-called "recapitulation



theory" the following is quoted from Alfred Fairhurst's *Organic Evolution Considered*, which is an American book (the present writer has it in his library): "There are radical differences between the embryos of vertebrates and invertebrates. Worms and other articulates in embryo lie doubled backwards around the yolk, while all vertebrates are doubled in the opposite direction. According to the theory that the embryonic condition is a recapitulation of the stages of organic evolution, this fundamental fact of invertebrate embryology ought to have been preserved by the vertebrate. Evolution gives no account of this reversal of position by the vertebrate." Yes, how can evolution account for this marked difference between the development of the foetus of the vertebrates and the invertebrates?

### Another Telling Difference

On the same subject our author quotes the following from John Urquhart's valuable book, *The Bible and How to Read It*: "M. de Quatrefages, the great French naturalist and anthropologist, shows that there is a difference in the order of the appearance of the folds in the brain which entirely disposes of the contention that man is descended from the ape. In man the folds which form the front part of the brain are completed first, and then those of the lesser lobe. In the ape the order is reversed. 'It is evident,' says Quatrefages, 'that, when two organized beings follow in their development a reverse process, the more elevated of the two cannot descend from the other by way of evolution.'" Mr. Messenger adds that the recapitulation theory fails "with respect to the whole vegetable world, for neither plants nor seeds climb their genealogical trees, and there is no trace of embryonic recapitulation in their case."

### The Nebulous Nebular Hypothesis

The official scientists themselves being the deponents, the once-popular nebular hypothesis, proposed by Laplace, has passed into a very nebular state in the scientific mind, if it has not been thrown head and hoof into the discard. It practically belongs today, after so brief a season of popularity, to the *debris* of rejected scientific hypotheses. Nothing seems really to have taken its place. The planetesimal theory does not appear to be adequate to the demands made upon it. The scientists still believe in an original nebula, or something like it, as the first form of matter. But that does not solve the real problem, which is, Whence came the

nebula? How came it into existence? To reply that no one knows is to throw up one's hands just at the most interesting point in the story, and say, "We give it up!" Yes, the nebula seems to be very nebulous.

### The Long Neck of the Giraffe

The story, as told by the evolutionists, is too familiar to need rehearsing here. Certain animals in times of drought stretched their necks to get at the green leaves higher up in the trees. Thus by degrees the giraffe got its long neck. On this subject an inquiring writer exclaims as follows: "But why, oh, clever evolutionist, has this neck-lengthening process stopped? Why is it that, in the whole period of recorded history, giraffes have possessed only the normal neck? Surely by now they should have necks capable of feeding upon the highest twigs of the highest trees, the nourishment from the young succulent shoots up aloft giving them still further advantages in the struggle for existence."

### Is not this Pantheism?

A liberalist, speaking over the radio, declared that God is not a personal being sitting upon a throne, as many crude people believe, but that He is "that cosmic process" which meets man in his greatest need and helps him to attain to the best and highest possible for him. But such a definition is not the outcome of clear and thorough thinking. The term "process" does not connote a person, but merely movement and method. It is an abstract term. A mere impersonal abstraction never could do what this Modernist attributes to it. It could not help man to the attainment of his best life and ideal. No; God is not a "process." He carries on processes for purposeful ends. God is that Supreme Person who is consciously present everywhere and is ever ready, willing and able to save men from sin and bestow upon them salvation, and then helps them on the way of progressive sanctification. The Bible represents Him as a Supreme Person sitting on the throne of the universe, which simply means that He reigns over every part of His creation. Only with such a Being can you and I hold intelligent communion. Only such a divine Being can answer prayer.

### Is this Consistent Thinking?

The radio speaker referred to in a foregoing paragraph is not always consistent with himself. He simply cancels everything in the Bible that does not agree with his liberalistic



views. The other day he stated positively that he does not believe in a personal devil, or, indeed, in any other kind of a devil. This, in spite of the frequent mention of his Satanic Majesty in the Old and New Testaments; yes, in spite of our Lord's recognition again and again of the existence of evil spirits. Yet, when on the same day he was asked whether he believed in the sinlessness of Christ, he declared that Christ had for all these centuries been under the searchlight of the intensest criticism, and yet no wrong had ever been found in Him or in His conduct. Then he added: "The verdict of the world on Christ agrees with that of Pilate, who said, 'I find no fault in Him.'" But how does this speaker know that Pilate's saying is authentic when so many other statements of the New Testament are not authentic? It is far more consistent to accept the whole Bible. It displays a more logical and spiritual type of mind.

### The Word "Day" in Genesis I

One of the neatest arguments that we have yet seen for the literal interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis is presented by a writer in the *Moody Monthly* for February, 1931. After quoting the verses: "And God called the light day, and the darkness He called night. And the evening and morning were the first day," the writer says: "From this it is clear that each day was composed of a period of light and a period of darkness of about equal length. If these days were long periods of time, what would become of animal and vegetable life during the periods of darkness? Then, again, if those days were long periods of time, did God rest for an equal period of time corresponding to one day when He finished creation?" It would be well to ponder these suggestions.

### Unique Summer School

The management of Winona Lake Institutions, an organization chartered under the State of Indiana for the purpose of conducting religious, educational and recreational work, is meeting with remarkable success in its Winona Lake School of Theology. A summer session of the school is conducted annually, including two semesters of fifteen days each. Nationally known educators representing the evangelical schools of the land, recognized as authority in their fields as teachers and authors, instruct classes here each summer.

During the past summer, almost a score of

states, and several foreign lands; also an equal number of religious denominations were represented by the student body. The officers of the school are as follows: Dr. W. E. Biederwolf, Director; Mr. C. E. Sawtelle, President; Dr. J. A. Huffman, Dean. The faculty for the 1931 session are: Dr. J. A. Huffman, Dean; Dr. George L. Robinson; Dr. J. R. Mantey; Dr. Leander S. Keyser; Dr. Melvin Grove Kyle.

The dates for the coming session are: First semester, July 8 to July 25; second semester, July 27 to August 14. A prospectus of twelve pages may be had by addressing Winona Lake School of Theology, Winona Lake, Indiana.

\* \* \*

### Evolution

"One does not have to make a long voyage on the ship *Beagle*, or penetrate tropical forests, or to live in a laboratory filled with microscopes to learn of evolution. Darwin saw artificial selection going on in the barnyard, Mendel did his epoch-making work on heredity, one of the chief factors of (should be, against) evolution, with peas in a cloister garden . . ."—*Evolution*, by Vernon Kellogg, p. 24.

We suppose Mr. Kellogg means we need not live in laboratories to know all about evolution provided we believe in it. A busy banker or an overworked farmer may write a learned treatise on evolution provided he advocates the doctrine and may read only one book on evolution and be well read provided he believes all he reads. But if he does not accept evolution he will remain ignorant no matter if he does live in a laboratory. Men do not understand the first principles of evolution until they accept it as true!—*W. B. Campbell*.

\* \* \*

### Cast Forth Evil

What, then, shall we do to be filled? What did they do in the days of Hezekiah, when the temple had had all kinds of iniquity and filth brought into it? The priests came and purged out all the filth that they found, and cast it into the brook Kidron. What did they do in Nehemiah's day, when Tobiah had filled God's chambers with household stuff? The prophet cast it all forth out of the Lord's house. What did the Lord Jesus do when the temple was filled with money-changers and sellers of merchandise? He made a scourge of small cords and drove them all out.—*H. W. Webb-Peploe, D.D.*



# Does Jesus Christ Know Everything?

## (A Study of His Intellects)

PROFESSOR HOYT F. HILL, D.D.

**T**HIS article is called forth by Dr. George H. Neal's editorial, in the December (1930) number of *The Essentialist*, entitled "Pre-eminent Bible Scholar." Dr. Neal quotes Dr. G. Campbell Morgan's question, "Is Mark 13:32 a confession of Christ's limitation?" and Dr. Morgan's answer, which asks us to "believe that He (Jesus Christ) indicated the one point of limitation" rather "than to imagine that general ignorance leaked out incidentally." It is obvious that His ignorance on "one point" would make it impossible for His followers to claim for Jesus Christ the honor due Deity.

We will limit our discussion, in this article, to Jesus Christ's knowledge. We will not, at this time, discuss the apparently contradictory statement of two very eminent theologians. One writes, "There is no proper sense in which the Babe, who lay in the arms of Mary, and who was given the name of Jesus, was at the same time also 'the Christ.'" The other one writes, "That Babe was as truly God as when He was absolute in the glory of God, the Father." We call attention to these statements here that the need of some adequate explanation of the person of our Lord may be the more clearly seen.

We will not, now, undertake any explanation of the problems connected with the physical appearing of Jesus Christ; nor will we touch those of His affectional natures; nor that of the human and divine wills; but we will discuss, in this article, the intellects of the incarnate word. The correct view of Jesus Christ must harmonize *all* the Gospel statements concerning His intellectual life.

### THE LOGOS

The Logos is one of the selves of the God-head. We can worship one who is (a) eternal, (b) omniscient, (c) perfect in all His attitudes, and (d) omnipotent, and we can worship none other. St. John definitely claims for the Logos the attributes of Deity and the great creeds of Christendom affirm the same. The Logos then is co-equal and co-eternal with God, the Father, and with God, the Holy Spirit.

It is confusing, to our thought, to speak of the Logos, before His incarnation, as the *Son*

of God. We had best follow St. John and refer to the pre-existent Christ as "the Logos" or "the Word." No writer of the New Testament refers to the pre-existent Logos as the *Son* of God. He became and was "declared to be the Son of God with power" after and as a result of His incarnation.

The self-consciousness of the Logos always registered His awareness of all His essential attributes. His awareness or self-consciousness of His essential attributes can never be eclipsed. God never goes to sleep. God can never cease to be alive and aware. There is room enough for the Pauline doctrine of the kenosis in the incarnation of the eternal Logos without postulating that He laid aside any essential of Deity. God, to be God, must forever remain God.

The intellect of the eternal Logos must differ from the human intellect. Our study of man's intellect is a study of the processes by which his intellect develops and becomes knowing. We assume that the Logos has always known everything. There was no process by which He arrived at His understanding. So we represent Him as having never learned yet as having always known. Therefore in thinking of the divine intellect we must be careful lest we attribute to it the limitations of the human.

### THE LOGOS TOOK HUMAN NATURE

"The Word was made flesh."

The most natural method by which the Logos could add human nature to Himself was the Virgin birth. This method provided for the creation of a new human being as in normal conception and gestation. In the chaste language of the Gospels we are informed that the center around which and from which this new human being grew was implanted by God. St. John tells us that this center was God, the Logos. St. Matthew says it was "of the Holy Spirit." St. Mark says that the self thus appearing was "the Son of God." St. Luke is very explicit and gives us many details, which the other evangelists omit.

My study of the wondrous person, known in history as Jesus Christ, and of His achievements during the last nineteen centuries com-



pels me to believe in the Virgin birth as the method by which such a person would most naturally appear among men. For the sake of those who may be faltering in their faith at this point we call attention to the fact that any other method presents more problems than it solves.

The human nature of Jesus Christ includes His human intellect. This human intellect of Jesus was, at first, as blank as that of any normal babe. Sense perception and sense interpretation, as He first came into contact with the world of things, helped His mind to unfold, as they do other children. The laws of association operated upon His mind; He played with phantasy and phantasy played with Him; memory and imagination came to His aid as to others. He learned to think in concepts and to reason accurately: witness His keenness in His discussions with the Pharisees. Probably, even while in the flesh in Palestine, He understood the meaning of "space," "time" and even "space-time" as well as "ultimate reality" and all the fine distinctions of the philosophers, psychologists and logicians. But, if He did, we need to keep in mind the fact that His development was that of a normal human intellect.

There is abundant evidence that there were many more than Dr. Morgan's "one point of limitation" and we do not have "to imagine that general ignorance leaked out incidentally." It was the necessary accompaniment (I had almost said "glory") of any real incarnation. St. Luke boldly states that the child, Jesus, "increased in wisdom." If so, He was learning and, if He was learning, there were things that He did not know. The episode at Jerusalem when Jesus was twelve years old shows us that on His human side He did not have prescience. He was so preoccupied with one idea as to be quite unaware of another. The incident fits perfectly into our understanding of the way a deeply spiritual, but normal boy mind would act. The thrill of learning at the Temple made Him unconscious of family relations and movements. So again some twenty years later, Jesus asks Mary and Martha, "Where have ye laid him?" I find it difficult to believe that Jesus would have asked this question if He had already known. Such instances in the recorded life of Jesus of Nazareth are so numerous that many will instantly suggest themselves to the reader. The Gospels reveal a very human Jesus Christ.

Jesus Christ, Himself, seems to have feared

that His essential humanity might be lost sight of. There are literally scores of texts in the Gospels where He refers to Himself as "the Son of Man," He never denied that He was "the Son of God." The Gospels represent His as cautiously admitting this: see Luke 23: 70 and Matt. 16:30-20, "Tell no man."

Frequently demons, about to be cast out, and the Devil, at His temptation, refer to Him as "the Son of God." Why Jesus' constant emphasis upon "the Son of Man?" Did He foresee any failure, on the part of His followers, to feel that He was "very man" as well as "very God"? Did He fear that such failure would result in a demand upon their part for another mediator between man and God? All men, when they try to face God, cry out with Job for a "daysman" (Job 9:33). The Roman Church has emphasized the Deity of Jesus Christ until, in practice, though not in theory, the Virgin Mary has become the human side of God. Cardinal Gibbons writes, "The Church exerts her children not only to honor the Blessed Virgin, but also to invoke her intercession" (*Faith of Our Fathers*, page 222). On the other hand certain Protestants have so neglected the emphasis upon the Deity of our Lord that there is danger of losing sight of the fact that He is the eternal Logos.

The historic creed of the orthodox Christian Church has ever maintained that Jesus Christ is "very man." We may not feel ourselves bound by the orthodox creed. But, while we seek a better statement of our faith, it may be well to take a brief look at what has been held as fundamental concerning the mind of the Master.

In Methodism the second article of religion says, "Two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together in one person, never to be divided; whereof is one Christ, very God and very Man."

The Chalcedonian (A. D. 451) symbol reads, "Our Lord Jesus Christ complete as to His Godhead and complete as to His manhood . . . known in two natures, without confusion, without conversion, without severance and without division: the distinction of the natures being in no wise abolished by their union, but the peculiarity of each nature being maintained and both concurring in one person."

The ancient heresies are with us today. The Roman Church, while holding the Chalcedonian symbol in theory, practically emphasizes



the fact of Jesus Christ's Deity far more than that of His human intellect. This attitude is also discerned in the Protestant Fundamentalist. On the other hand the, so called, Modernist insists that Jesus Christ is "very man" and usually finds it expedient to place little or no emphasis upon the fact that He is also "very God." In our time most of the ancient heresies are being taught from Christian pulpits.

How may we escape the heresy we hear? If we hold to the Chalcedonian symbol, which clearly postulates two natures in Jesus Christ, unmixed and unchanged, how may we escape the Nestorian heresy of two selves, in the person of Jesus, the Christ? If we hold that the human nature of Jesus Christ was not and is not subject to ordinary human limitations, such as ignorance and errors of judgment, etc., how shall we escape the fate accorded Eutyches at the council of Chalcedon? And, if the Chalcedonian symbol is not true and the two natures do not exist in Jesus Christ, how have we any real Saviour?

If Jesus Christ is merely a great teacher, like Confucius or Gautama, how does our religion differ from pagan faiths?

*The Logos took human nature, yet Jesus Christ is one self.* Jesus Christ always spoke of Himself as one self. He used the personal pronouns. This fact is so well known to all readers of the Gospels that no references need be given.

The center of Jesus Christ's self is His consciousness. This, of course, includes His self-consciousness. Here is registered all that He knows. Here registers all knowledge because "God was the Logos." Here registers all that His human intellect has grasped because "the Logos was made flesh." I understand that "flesh" here includes the human intellect: not that it is material, the brain, but that it is human. Here are registered all the mental processes that take place in His developing human nature. His human intellect, like our own, may not be able to perceive the processes by which it grows, yet these processes register themselves in His self-consciousness. Similar processes in our development are not always registered in our self-consciousness. They can be registered in Him because He possessed (or was) self-consciousness before the addition of His human intellect. His consciousness, including His self-consciousness, was changed from a divine consciousness to a theanthropic consciousness at the time of His incarnation. Then "new facts of consciousness" (Miley's

*Systematic Theology*, Vol. II, page 25) came to Him. Not that He knew any more; but that knowledge came to Him through ordinary human channels. Thus His theanthropic consciousness is the center where His divine and His human natures meet. So He is but one self.

The Gospels represent Jesus Christ as communicating knowledge from God to men. And this was always done through His human nature. It follows then that what His human intellect could not sense (we sense many things that we do not understand) or perceive He could not communicate. It was frequently true that He could not communicate because those about Him could not perceive. They had eyes but saw not. His human nature grasps far more than He can get men to understand. When Jesus was an infant in the arms of Mary, His human intellect grasped very little. When a Lad, He understood more. When He became a man, He grasped still more of the divine mind. Because His human intellect is finite there is still much that He does not yet understand or even perceive. Whether "that day or that hour" (Mark 13:32) refers to the destruction of Jerusalem or to the end of the age, He said that His human intellect had not yet grasped the exact date. He told many of the circumstances and what His followers should do. His human intellect understood that Lazarus was dead but it appears that He did not know exactly where the tomb was. Of course His divine omniscience could have informed His human intellect as to its location as well as Mary and Martha did; but, as a matter of fact, it apparently had not been done that way.

How could Jesus Christ say that the "Son" did not know when, as a matter of fact, the Logos did know? Were I asked if I knew music, I would respond in the negative. Yet I very greatly enjoy the harmony and the melody of good music and, when my neighbor tunes in for radio jazz, I suffer. Still I truthfully affirm that I do not know music because I cannot communicate it either by my voice or through my finger tips. I play no musical instrument.

While we say with Saint Hilary of Poitiers (A.D. 300-367) *Totus hominis Filius est Dei Filius* and vice versa (The entire human Son is the Son of God and the entire divine Son is the Son of Man) we must recognize the fact that Jesus Christ was, while here in the flesh, and still is revealing God to men through His human nature. Because of this essential fact, when He speaks of Himself as the "Son," He



usually seems to have His human nature most prominently in mind.

The very practical question of the inerrancy of the Gospel teachings of Jesus Christ pushes itself to the front at this point. Was the human intellect of the incarnate Logos able to rid itself of all the false teachings of His day? Some of these teachings were universally accepted: for instance, that the earth was flat. We know that He corrected man's thinking on many points. Can one believe for a moment that a self, so wondrously constituted as He, could fail to do the last thing that was *essential* to the success of His mission? True He did not directly attack slavery, then an intrenched and respectable institution, but, as we can see today, He did wisely in deferring that attack until the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Ought we to fellowship with those who may believe that Jesus of Nazareth, on His human side, may not have known that **this earth is a sphere?** Or perhaps may not have known that Moses did not write the Pentateuch? Some of us still think that Moses had a good deal to do with the first five books of the Bible. Suppose the human intellect of Jesus Christ accepted some things that later He has found to be false. My rule is the rule of St. John (1 John 4:2). To accept the central fact of Christianity, namely, that the Logos added human nature to God, is to place oneself where all these minor questions will ultimately be answered by the incarnate Logos, Himself.

Today men need to know that Jesus Christ is God. Men need to feel that Jesus Christ is human today. There is inspiration and the pledge of comradeship in "never to be divided" in our creed. When men realize that His human intellect is still developing; that He is just a little ahead of us; they will feel that He is "touched with the feeling of our infirmities"; that He is indeed "like unto His brethren" and that we are "His brethren." Then men will come near to the Great Friend. This world longs for the touch of our Living Brother, the Godman, the incarnate Logos, our Savior, Jesus Christ.

Syracuse, N. Y.

\* \* \*

## Two Striking Conversions

*Anthony Zeoli was a Roman Catholic, faithful in attendance at mass; also dope-fiend and all-around crook who would pick the pockets of his kneeling fellow worshipers. "In the old days that are now gone forever," he writes,*

"I used to pray morning and night. I would not pull off a job with any other criminal except I first prayed about it. I would tell my pals to pray before we burgled a house. When they said they knew no prayer I told them the prayer to pray." Zeoli's career as gangster and gunman in the Philadelphia underworld brought him finally to prison. There a New Testament fell into his hands which two colored youths, also converts, expounded to him. The result, —he fell on his knees crying, "God be merciful to me a sinner." It was a fresh illustration of the Everlasting Mercy. In a moment the old life and its appetites had passed away forever. Convict 9924 was a new creature in Christ Jesus.

The next day he went into the prison yard to preach the Gospel and the first person he met was the prison chaplain. "I asked him why he didn't tell the prisoners about Jesus and how to get rid of sin. I started immediately to witness to all the convicts, 1,600 of them, and most of all to my companion in crime." But the latter was obstinate and refused. Both he and Zeoli left prison at the same time, one to die of an overdose of dope, the other to become a flaming evangelist. *The Evangelical Christian* tells what followed:

"On the expiration of his sentence he went home and witnessed for Christ to his unsaved brothers and sisters. He found a job at a foundry and there worked ten hours a day. When he got home at night he changed clothes, washed, and went down into his old haunts, there to preach Jesus Christ. He went into rescue missions and grabbed people on the street to tell them what Christ had done for him. Judges who had convicted him, detectives who had arrested him, both had to hear his story. Formerly he ran away from them; now they avoided him, knowing that he would buttonhole them and speak to them the words of salvation."

No. 2. *Samuel Strutz, of Chicago*, was a cabinet maker by trade, but bootlegger by profitable avocation. He came from Russian Poland in 1913. One morning he happened to tune in on the morning devotions of the Family Altar League, WMBI. He became interested and decided to look up the Moody Bible Institute which owns the station. On his way over he stopped at a street meeting held by Moody students, knelt in the streets, and was converted. He is now deacon at a West Side mission, and Sunday afternoons holds meetings at the county hospital.—*Sunday School Times*.



## Is Human Life Fated?

C. H. BUCHANAN, D.D.

THE question of freedom *versus* necessity has for centuries been a vexed question of philosophy. It made its presence felt in the ancient's Grecian philosophy, in Homer's poetry, and even the great Grecian tragedies were full of it. The church fathers found it a bone of contention which greatly colored their theology, thereby influencing early Christianity. The Roman rulers held to necessity because it suited their tyrannical idea of government. Then, too, it served as a smoke screen to hide their many cruelties and oppressions.

Fate was the scapegoat for all manner of iniquities. When the people were taught that the universe was governed by fixed law and that all events were brought about by fate, resistance seemed like treason and calamities were to be endured rather than prevented or removed. Resignation to such things was considered a great virtue, an indication of superior piety. Thus for centuries necessity prevailed and was considered the way of wisdom. It can readily be seen that multitudes of dependent people, governed by a monarch, would readily accept such a philosophy, since it secured to them even a slave's existence and protection. No doubt that many who were in subjection to a powerful ruler, felt that such a condition was a heavenly ordinance and but the rule of divine approval. Was it not in such an atmosphere the "divine right of kings" was born? Such a doctrine, when fanned into a flame, became a dominant religion which carried its votaries into murderous conquests and untold atrocities. Such was not Christianity, but false philosophy.

For more than a thousand years this philosophy darkened the sky of Christianity, and by standing in the way of truth, reduced the power and blocked the way of the kingdom of heaven. It injured her prestige and by making God the author of sin, incurred the contempt of right minded men.

Men who were not under the dominance of some great ruler, were free to think otherwise. Such master minds as Athenasius fought heroically against fatalism; but when Roman power triumphed freedom slept, the Dark Ages dawned and feudalism and mediæval institutions rose.

In the atmosphere of such political influ-

ences, it is easy to see how that Plato, in the days of Grecian republics, could be an advocate of freedom of thought, while Collins, Locke, and Hume, under the reign of monarchs, were advocates of necessity. Immanuel Kant, under Frederick the Great, could advocate freedom, cautiously. We should not accuse men of trimming their sails to catch the fancies of crowned heads. No; but to judge men truly such chromatic tints due to atmospheric conditions must be recognized. Thus, much history is shaped. In the days of modern republics men can be true philosophers.

### LIBERTY AN INNATE IMPULSE

There is nothing so sweet to the human heart as the sense of liberty, and nothing so galling as its suspension. Wherever experienced, whether in prison or slavery, nothing so degrades men as the withholding of their freedom. When souls are free to think they will reach the *natural right of man*, which is to think for oneself and to exercise self-government. Thinking men instinctively feel that they have a God-given right of self-government. With Fichte, we all feel that, "the deepest fact in all the universe is free Spirit!" Since the days of Epicurus, men have felt that "it would be better to believe all the fables concerning the gods than to be a slave to the fatalism taught by the materialistic philosophers" (*Life of Epicurus*, 27. Leatius).

Just here emerges the secret of much of the trouble men find in considering freedom: they do not distinguish between the facts of material nature and the phenomena of mental activity. Men fail to remember that with all the natural laws, there is a realm where personality is supreme.

### FIXED LAW VS. LIBERTY

There is fixed law only in the material realm; in human life there is the law of personality. There is the fixed law of gravitation, but applied energy suspends it. There are the laws of heat and cold, but science, to a limited extent, overcomes them, and man lives comfortably. Nature gives us diamonds; but man must polish them to reveal their sparkling beauty. On the same condition God gives us reason; but we must do the judging. He gives us a religious nature; but we must be religious.



"Salvation is of the Lord;" but we "must work out our own salvation." All this is not two laws at cross-purposes with themselves; it is the plan of human personality and liberty. It lets man be the master of his own life; the captain of his own salvation.

With the fixed laws of nature all about him, man knows that he is in the realm of liberty and that the conditions of life are largely in his control, and that the results are contingent upon his initiative and persistent activity. Whatever his limitations, however hard pressed he may be, he sees that life is what he makes it, and that till he forfeits his liberty he is a free being. Dr. Samuel Johnson used to make short work of the problem of liberty, and say: "*I know that I am free!*"

#### PITIABLY WEAK ARGUMENTS

Besides, the arguments in favor of necessity are pitifully weak; they will not stand alone. Necessity is the denial of freedom of will, and this, universally applied, means *fatalism*; and this pushed to conclusion means *atheism*. Fatalism claims that God acts from the necessity of His nature and cannot act otherwise than He does. But, if God be not sovereign, free and omnipotent, but under inexorable law, He is not supreme, but a subject, therefore, not God. There must be somewhere a great First cause to which God is subject,—which is absurd.

Moreover, *necessity* even if true, cannot be proved. To admit the possibility of its being true long enough to consider an argument in its favor, would be to admit that human thought is necessarily false. It would be like admitting that a man is dead, then going about to prove that he is not alive,—which would be to surrender all confidence in one's own conclusions. Rejecting, as fatalists do, all intuitive truths such as "spiritual things are spiritually discerned," and rejecting all ultimate principles, such as "all results must have an adequate cause," there is no foundation on which an argument for necessity can stand. It is against the convictions of humanity.

Jonathan Edwards attempted by "motivity" to show how "God works a human volition." His essay on the *Freedom of the Will* has been pronounced unanswerable, "the master-piece of a genius." Now, this is true only when his major premise is admitted. Deny this and his argument falls to pieces. And this denial we make. How can God work a *human* volition? If the volition be human God does not work

it. If God works it the volition is *divine* and not human. So there the troublesome matter ends. All the arguments founded on motives go to pieces in the light of the fact that the human mind is not determined, but is itself the determiner. It does the considering, the selecting, and the determining. It alone has the power to *will* to act.

#### IMMANUEL KANT ON SENSATIONS

Germane to the doctrine of motives is the doctrine of sensations. Locke held that "mind was not free, but must obey the edicts of sensation." With this both Hume and Spinoza agreed, but Immanuel Kant thought otherwise. He found that freedom of mind is necessary to all knowledge from sensation, or experience. Said he:

Various impressions come to us through the channels of sensation,—through the thousand different nerves. They come to the brain through the skin, the eyes, the ears, the tongue. What a medley of messages they must be as they crowd into the mind, calling for attention!

No wonder Plato spoke of "the rable of the senses!" Left to themselves they remain "rable," chaotic, manifold, pitifully impotent, waiting to be ordered into meaning and purpose and power. "As well," says Kant, "might the messages from a thousand battle lines weave themselves into comprehension and command."

No; there is a law-giver for this mob, a controlling and connecting power which, not only receives, but takes these atoms of sensation and moulds them into sense. Only the free independent *self* can accomplish this. While natural causes are under necessity, the co-ordinating mind is free to design, command, achieve.

Locke, forgetting the intuitive, instinctive impulse, said: "There is nothing in the intellect but such as has been in sensations." Leibnitz adds: "Nothing but the intellect itself." And he was right. If the mind were not free to consider, co-ordinate and command,—if precepts wove themselves automatically into order and command—how account for the same conditions leaving the mediocre man behind while lifting the alert one into personal triumph? Thus the difference in the individual attainment of men in the same social atmosphere, may be accounted for.

The passive, indolent soul—a kind of waste product in society—may allow himself to be shoved about by the waves of circumstances and be contented to be a "nobody." Of him



little is to be said. He is not a factor in determining the laws of life.

But there is another dynamic, alert and progressive class of whom much is to be said. These are persons of decided personality with a driving force in society today. These persons constitute the factors from which social laws and human philosophy may be drawn. They are the beacon lights of human truths.

Are such characters to be considered as mere "creatures of circumstances," plastic to a power over which they have no control? Nay, verily. They are determiners of issues, the moulders of conditions, the vanguards of human advancement. It is the investment of one's intelligence and energies that makes the difference in men. Here human responsibility finds its origin, founded on the freedom of will and the investment of self in good or bad. Without such freedom how could there be such a thing as personal attainment, merit, or progress?

Immanuel Kant said: "Two things make me to shudder: the starry heavens and responsibility within." The first, because of the vastness and splendor of the infinite reign of God; the latter, because of the weight of responsibility growing out the investment of human talents, or the possible mismanagement of the same. Into this second item there enters all that constitutes human history,—all science, wisdom and incentives to noble living.

Yes, the use or abuse of life's opportunities is enough to make any man to shudder, as it did Kant. But if there be *necessity*, and all things are determined and fixed, so that no one can do otherwise than he does, whence the responsibility and why the shuddering? The keenest intellect cannot discover any grounds for responsibility, if liberty be denied.

It would seem reasonable to suppose that after the years of study and strife among the philosophers—those men who are supposed to hold the keys to wisdom—some definite conclusion in the matter of freedom *versus* necessity would have been reached; but, among the materialists, such seems not to be the case.

In the clearly shining light of today, so far as these men are concerned, there is still uncertainty with "confusion worse confounded." For have we not "scientists" who stand bold upright and say: "Freedom of will has been knocked into a cocked hat" (J. B. Watson). Others say dogmatically: "There is no such thing as freedom of will, or mental liberty." Others say: "We are all machines." All this,

no doubt, does not express the conclusions of unbiased reasoning, but is put forward in defense of some pet hypothesis based on a materialistic philosophy, blind to the errors of necessity.

#### THE VERDICTS OF COMMON SENSE

While such views are to be regretted, there is a safe haven, the refuge of the *verdicts of common sense*:

1. Necessity, or fatalism, contradicts the universal convictions of the human family. All men, fatalists included, believe that history might have been different. Men everywhere hold that there is such a thing as crime and will punish one for heinous offences, even to taking his life.

2. All men believe that present events can be controlled and thereby human life may be protected and bettered. Who does not instinctively dodge danger, turn in a fire-alarm, and hasten to send for a physician when seriously sick? "Self-preservation is the first law of nature."

3. All men agree that there is such a thing as *common justice*, as between man and man, and they rebel at being defrauded or held responsible for deeds over which they have no control. Patience in such conditions is commendable, and men grow great in such endurance; but for being *punished* for such things, they grow sullen and rightfully resentful.

4. All men believe that by wise and well-applied effort the future can be made better than the present, and such a belief makes the future radiant with the promise of progress; and they think that it is largely a man's own fault if his lot is not happy, nor his sky bright. Some spirits are such as to make any desert blossom as a rose.

5. All men claim an equal right to the opportunities in the struggles of life,—a chance with others, man with man in the world. When this is denied men feel oppressed, they chafe and become rebellious. When compelled to endure they degenerate and lose the sense of exalted manhood. They feel they have been denied a God-given right.

These are *verdicts of humanity*, the dictums of common sense, implying human sovereignty of will and action. In the exercise of such sovereignty mankind becomes cheerful, buoyant and efficient; but being denied it, the race becomes despondent, sullen and hopeless, lapsing



into lethargy and desuetude. Such a state is in direct violation of the natural impulses and inspiring hopes of humanity. With no other argument, these alone should be sufficient to convince sane mankind of the error of necessity. Surely God did not decree a gloomy, hopeless life for man, His noblest creation.

Much of the world's sorrows and many of its defeats are due to the fact of ignoring the sovereignty of human personality. Duke of Alva, in his administration of affairs in Belgium, tried to suppress religious liberty by murderous force and failed miserably; and his failure is the lot of many who have held to this philosophy in government. He pushed his theory but forgot that he was dealing with free men who, in spite of dungeons and flaming stakes, refused to be driven.

Rulers who have not reckoned with their subjects, but have aimed to govern by some splendid theory, have failed because they overlooked the personality of man. Boyd Carpenter observes that England committed this folly when she was dealing with the American colonies. She was deaf to the pleas of Edmund Burke when he reminded her that,

In the struggle she was dealing with *men*; and not by bonds nor affidavits and clearances could she bind America to the mother country. An Englishman is the unfittest man on earth to argue another Englishman into slavery.

Frederick the Great was wont to say: "If I want to ruin a province I would commit its government to philosophers." It is well known the kind of philosophers there were till the advent of Kant, late in his reign. They were practically all necessitarians, clear back to Constantine, the Roman emperor. What Frederick meant was that philosophers were theorists, prone to forget that they were dealing with persons, or free men who refuse to surrender their right to think.

Humanity is like a game of chess; all of the chess-men may be taken except one. Knights, bishops, castles may be taken, but not a King. So with man; all of his faculties—his wealth, health, ambitions and fancies—may all be manipulated but when his sovereign personality is touched, there the limit is reached.

Manipulate as one may, man remains man, and at any moment he may rise up and demand his sovereign rights, namely, to be as nature intended him, have the privilege of living his life in his own way. The revolutions of nations and the triumphs of heroes, all stand in proof of this statement. Freedom to

think, to initiate and to achieve is a right which man will have.

#### LAGGING NATIONS VS. PROGRESS

Those nations which have not enjoyed perfect freedom and have not been encouraged to think for themselves, have lagged in the race of national life. They occupy a subordinate place in history; they have not developed a high-class literature: they are without a science, and are lacking in heroes. However much they may have had a place in the sun because of their bloody conquests, they have gone down in the scale of nations and are fit subjects for the junk-heap, as not being dominant forces in the world today. There must be some definite reason for this. Doubtless that reason is a philosophic error.

Yet, we hear much in "modern" parlance of a world-force which is carrying us forward to some far-off glory land and ideal age. A great essayist speaks of "a force not ourselves which makes for righteousness." John Fiske thought that, "the feelings and habits of strife will ultimately die out from disuse and a strange civilization will be reached in which human sympathy will be all in all." Lord Tennyson wrote of "one far off divine event towards which the whole of creation moves." One still more optimistic thinks that, "just over the hill the Promised Land stretches out to the far horizon smiling in eternal sunshine."

These we recognize as roseate dreams; but the facts indicated by social conditions are far different from showing such promise. Besides, we well know that there is no Promised Land to be reached without a wilderness strife, a law-giving Moses and a lion-hearted leader like Joshua. In the leadership of such men the future has a promise; but depending upon dreamers looking for an "involuntary progress," there is only a dark foreboding.

We must believe that necessity is an insidious pitfall. Joseph Butler said: "Necessity is the very basis on which infidelity stands" (*Analogy* Chap. IV. C). The horrors, crimes, and tyranny of the Inquisition were the fruits of necessity,—a belief that it was the will of God that all men should think with the persecutors.

P. S.—Knowing the possible outcome of such a doctrine, shall the civilized world sit in silence and let a famous defender of criminals, say of the two youths who killed a fellow student for the thrill of it: "They were not responsible for their deed; they were caught in the current of conditions over which they had



no control." This lawyer is an *evolutionist*, with whom a large number of the criminal class stands, believing in a philosophy based on necessity from start to finish.

This writer refuses to be one to sit in silence and thus become *particeps criminis* in promulgating such a pernicious philosophy.

Richmond, Kentucky.

## Is Belief in the Supernatural Rational?

W. MASLIN FRYINGER, D.D.

THIS question requires answers to several other questions. What is meant by nature? By the natural? By the supernatural? By natural law? By rationality? To get reliable definitions of these terms we must consult the lexicographers.

Webster defines nature as "The existing system of things; the aggregate of known causes and effects; the world of matter or of matter and mind; the creation; the universe." The Standard Dictionary makes it "The system of all created things, material and spiritual, including all forms of being but the supernatural." These leading authorities are almost synonymous in their explication of the term.

The natural is defined by Webster as "Having to do with the existing system of things; . . . belonging to nature." By the Standard as "Having to do with objects in the order of nature; opposed to supernatural." By the latter clause we understand it to mean that the term "natural" is opposed to "supernatural" simply in meaning, so that the two definitions agree and are easily comprehended.

The meaning of the supernatural is said by Webster to be "Being beyond, or exceeding the powers or laws of nature;" and by the Standard as "Existing or taking place through some agency above the forces of nature; being outside of the range or operation of natural law." Both of these definitions refer to natural laws as operating in nature, which is introducing an unscientific idea.

Webster corrects this unscientific idea in his definition of natural laws, as being no more than "A statement of an order or relation of phenomena which, so far as known, is invariable under the given conditions;" but the Standard fails to make this correction, making natural laws "The uniform occurrence of natural phenomena in the same way or order under the same conditions," so far agreeing with Webster, but adding the qualifying clause, "Also, the assumed cause of such uniformity."

It is certainly unscientific to attribute causality to what are called natural laws. "The expression, laws of nature," says J. S. Mill, "means

nothing but the uniformities which exist among natural phenomena." Huxley says: "It is desirable to remember that which is very often forgotten, that the laws of nature are not the cause of the order of nature, but only our way of stating as much as we have made out of that order." The materialistic notion that causality attaches to natural law is only hypothetical. Such laws are not self-existent; they exist only in the minds of those who need the idea to give support to their theories.

In the light of the above definitions, we are prepared to accept the Standard's rendition of rationality, that it means "Characterized by reasonableness; conformable to reason," and Webster's common-sense rendering, that it is "Agreeable to reason; not absurd, preposterous, extravagant, foolish, fanciful, or the like."

Having defined our terms, we come back to the original question, Is belief in the supernatural rational? That it is so appears from several considerations. First of all,

### THE SUPERNATURAL IS A POSSIBILITY.

Materialists deny this. But science makes their denial a mere, if not a monstrous, assumption. That the universe is boundless is self-evident. As to space, the knowledge of man is limited to geometrical dimensions. The boundless universe transcends all that he can know. To deny the possibility of the supernatural is to assume infinite knowledge. Further, the self-evident existence of a boundless universe, as to time and space, is itself an evidence of the possibility of the supernatural, for the infinite *is* supernatural, being not only beyond all man knows of the natural, but beyond his utmost powers of perception and conception. As a possibility the supernatural challenges human belief and makes that belief rational. Again,

### THE SUPERNATURAL IS A PROBABILITY.

There are probabilities which almost amount to certainties, and while not altogether reaching the degree of certainty yet afford sufficient ground for rational belief. The supernatural

finds this height of probability in man. Every man who reflects seriously is conscious that he is the product of a power, not lower, but higher than himself; conscious of his responsibility to this higher power; conscious that to create him, with his wonderful faculties of perception and conception, required a power far greater than any nature reveals.

It is this consciousness which chiefly constitutes what we call conscience, that dominant faculty which if obeyed puts us at peace with God and ourselves, or if disobeyed "makes cowards of us all." And it is this that makes man incurably religious.

Archbishop Trench, whose *Study of Words* is, as has been said, "his noble and enduring monument," says that language proves man's supernatural origin and destiny. "How else," he asks "could all those words which testify of his relation to God, and of his consciousness of this relation, and which ground themselves thereon, have found their way into this, the veritable transcript of his innermost life, the genuine utterance of the faith and hope which is in him?"

Man finds within himself promptings which urge to a longing for more than nature can give—desires and aspirations which nature cannot fulfill. He cannot but recognize the probability that he possesses an immortal nature, that he is destined for a supernatural state, that this world is but a school of discipline for a higher world. If he is nothing more than an animal, and, whatever progress he may make in knowledge, death will end all, then his present existence is a mockery, whatever may have been his origin.

But his reason repudiates this mockery. It tells him that he is a spiritual being, that only a future life under supernatural conditions can satisfy the longing hope which inspires his breast, and that this very hope begets the probability that this will be his destiny.

Alfred Russell Wallace speaks of the belief of Dr. Bentley, whom he designates as "the greatest eighteenth century scholar," that "The soul of one virtuous man is of greater worth and excellency than the sun and all his planets and all the stars in the heavens;" and who says that all who believe with him, "that man is the unique and supreme product of this vast universe," will see no difficulty in going a little further, and believe that "the universe was actually brought into existence for this very purpose." Wallace's comment on this is that "With infinite space around us and infinite

time before and behind us, there is no incongruity in this conception."

If this eminent agnostic could see the rationality of such a belief in the supernatural as a probability, surely our contention is right. Another consideration which renders belief in the supernatural rational is that

#### THE SUPERNATURAL IS A CERTAINTY.

If certainty affords infallible ground for rational belief, the supernatural is susceptible of such belief, for it is not an assumption but a certainty. Science demonstrates this. Scientists in general agree that, as Alfred Russell Wallace says, "We have infinite space around us, and infinite time before and behind us."

In *Man's Place in the Universe* he says further: "Of infinity in any of its aspects we can really know nothing but that it exists and is inconceivable. . . . To me its existence is absolute but unthinkable—that way madness lies." The very fact that to attempt to comprehend infinity tends to destroy, and in some instances has dethroned human reason, is evidence that it is supernatural.

The infinite cannot but be supernatural, for all nature as we know it is finite. Some extremists reduce it to such finiteness as to make all material objects mere abstractions. Berkeleyanism, however, would not only make void all natural law, but by giving only abstract existence to material objects would make a human observer himself greater than nature, and thus prove the rationality of belief in the supernatural.

But, finite as nature may be, some of its processes and results indicate the supernatural. Borden P. Bowne said, "Nature is supernatural in its causality." Darwin said of the schemes to which plants resort to insure cross-fertilization that "they transcend in incomparable degree the contrivances and adaptations which the most fertile imagination of the most imaginative man could suggest, with unlimited time at his disposal." If that is not an attestation of the supernatural in nature, what is it?

Dr. W. Bell Dawson, eminent English scientist, in a small but most remarkable work, has shown beyond question that chemical transmutations, vegetable growth and varied development, animal life sustained by food converted into nourishment, and human intelligence and invention by which are controlled or overruled many laws of nature making them to serve man's own ends—all these so-called natural phenomena are beyond human comprehension; and instead of according with natural laws,



virtually contradict them, and by demonstrating that "higher forces can dominate and modify the realms below them," the processes and results which these forces bring about are as miraculous as some of the incidents related in the Bible.

Dr. William Hanna Thomson, than whom there is no greater authority on brain physiology, in his exhaustive treatment of *Brain and Personality*, proves beyond doubt that, instead of the brain making man, as materialists say, it is man that makes his brain, that the brain centres of speech and thought do not exist at birth but are developed by the creative power of the will. "Human brain matter," he says, "does not become human in its powers until Something within it takes it in hand to fashion it. . . . This Something is not natural, but supernatural, both in its powers and in its creations by means of those powers. . . . This Something can be no other than that greatest of realities here, the Self or the Human Personality." No one can read his wonderful book, *Brain and Personality* with an open mind, and not come to the conclusion which is his own, that man is supernatural, created in the image of God and not in the image of a beast.

Thus nature itself, as science is demonstrating, is manifesting the certainty of the supernatural and making belief in it rational.

While the line of thought we have pursued may be helpful to some who are weak in the faith, we who believe in the supernatural as the ground of our hope of immortality need nothing more to assure us of the certainty of that hope than the heart-comfort, the innate persuasion we experience, "while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal."

—Healdsburg, California.

\* \* \*

## Our Presidents and God's Word

IT WAS an attorney for the Soviet government who made application at Albany for a charter for an Anti-Bible Society. How different the tradition of America! The appropriateness of Mr. Hoover's inaugural Bible verse, Proverbs 29:18, was obvious and gave great relief and satisfaction to patriotic Americans: "Where there is no vision, the people perish: but he that keepeth the law, happy is he."

The verses chosen on like occasions by his predecessors show both acquaintance with the Scriptures and reverence for them. Coolidge, remembering how his grandfather used to read John 1:1-14 to him in the Vermont farmhouse, selected that passage for his inaugural Scripture. Harding chose Micah 6:8: "What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"

In the stress and anxiety of war-time President Wilson chose Psalm 46:1: "God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble." The text for his first inaugural was Psalm 119:43-46. Taft's passage was 1 Kings 3:9-11, from Solomon's prayer: "Give therefore thy servant an understanding heart to judge thy people, that I may discern between good and bad."

"Be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only" (Jas. 1:22) was Theodore Roosevelt's characteristic selection. McKinley chose Proverbs 16:20, 21: "He that handleth a matter wisely shall find good: and whoso trusteth in the Lord, happy is he"; for his first inaugural, 2 Chronicles 1:10: "Give me now wisdom and knowledge, that I may go out and come in before this people; for who can judge this thy people that is so great?" Cleveland's selection was Psalm 112:4-10, beginning, "Unto the upright there ariseth light in the darkness"; for his second inaugural Psalm 91:11-16 with the verse, "I will set him on high, because he hath known my name. . . I will deliver him, and honour him."

Harrison chose Psalm 121 with the verse, "My help cometh from the Lord, which made heaven and earth." Arthur's selection was the appropriate passage Psalm 31:1-3: "In thee, O Lord, do I put my trust; let me never be ashamed. . . For thy name's sake lead me, and guide me." Garfield's was Proverbs 21:1: "The king's heart is in the hand of the Lord, as the rivers of water: he turneth it whithersoever he will."

That is perhaps enough to show the temper of the men who lead the American people. May our reverence for the Word of God be upheld and strengthened as the years go by.—*Sunday School Times*.

\* \* \*

Incomparably more failures in life are due to a breakdown in character than to any other cause.—*Southern Methodist*.

## Christian Evidences

BISHOP H. M. DuBOSE, D.D., LL.D.

### Has Christianity a Mystical Side?

OUR present interest in what has been philosophically treated of as religious mysticism relates to the extent to which it may be brought to witness to the truth and integrity of the evangel, or may be appraised as a department, or possibility, of Christian experience. Definitions of mysticism have been so many and varied that one is hard put to settle on that which is most likely to accord with the historical idea. In the earlier centuries there were schools of Christian thought given over to mystical studies, as there were communities of ascetics who sought to live themselves into the experience of religious mysticism.

But we are not likely to learn from one or the other of these anything of real value in determining what the New Testament itself would justify as a statement of mysticism. The schools of the mystic generally had to do with seeking for hidden interpretations of Scripture words and institutions; while the life of the community mystics was more of mode and habit than of the motion and power of the spiritual life.

Mysticism infested the cloister from the beginning of monasticism in the church; indeed, in a large sense, mysticism created the monastery and maintained it until it was transmuted into an industrial corporation or a propagandum for the extension of papal ecclesiasticism. It also was the influence and instrument which etched into the doctrines of the church such theological abnormities as transubstantiation, the immaculate conception of Mary, the assumption, and the sacramental excesses of the papal ritual. This process described a long history toward, and through, medieval life. Whatever happy ideals of mysticism may have instituted the beginning of this process, it ended in abuses of ritual and in semi-fetichism.

These considerations make it clear that little help could come to us from an appeal to either the historical or ritualistic side of mysticism, as represented from the middle to the later cen-

turies of Christianity. Such appeal is the usual order observed in the study of mysticism; but the argument invariably wastes itself in stale and unprofitable generalities. However, this much may be allowed as coming from inquiry into historic mysticism, namely, that by mysticism generally has been meant unusual and exalted stages of what may be regarded as the normal experience of those who are in the state of grace and salvation.

This much is to the good of our thought; but the ideal of the mystic was so confused by scholasticism, monasticism and ritualism as to have proven the least assured of all the results attained. A mystery of obscurantism, rather than a mystery of illumination, was the net outcome. Nevertheless, great examples of individual mystics appear here and there. If their stories be wholly dependable, such witnesses as St. Anthony, St. Francis and St. Cecilia are in line with a sublime spirituality. Thousands of others also entered in, despite the handicaps of an abortive mysticism.

But, all questions of credence and tolerance aside, it is certain that our appeal must be to the New Testament, whose records are the final test of mysticism, as of all other spiritual values. The issue, therefore, becomes direct: "As historically exhibited, and doctrinally defined, in the New Testament, has Christianity a mystical side?" The answer is equally direct; "Beyond a doubt, within the purview of our definition, Christianity, as an experience, has a mystical side." A measure of this mysticism belongs to what already has been described as the normal life of discipleship; but a measure also belongs to those exceptional stages of attainment which, although transcending sense, do not travel beyond the truths which are the common heritage of all believers. There are diversities of gifts, but one Spirit.

Besides its operation in the normal course of Christian living, the true mysticism of faith must be construed as having relationship with those vitalities of the gospel which can be



fully shared only through prolonged devotion, sacrifice, and the immolation of self in aspiring thought. "This kind goeth out only by fasting and prayer." Those accredited high points of experience attained by the saints and faithful of the past are to be referred to gospel precedents, though unconsciously followed and realized.

Also, it cannot be questioned that the higher contacts of the gospel are still left open to men of extraordinary devotion and faith. Elijah, St. Paul, and St. John, who, under this definition are the master mystics of the ages, are not without successors in finding the way which opens toward God. Especially from the Epistles of St. Paul, the impression is unescapable that the office of prophecy, in some true and effective sense, was meant to abide in the church, not to the end of an addendum to gospel revelation; but in perpetual identification and confirmation of its truth and power. Here is the field of the absolute mysticism of the New Testament.

The spiritual needs of the present troubled age of thought call for a fellowship of souls, mystically touched and wrought upon, to stand in the stead of God, and to incarnate the power of His word. It does not transcend belief that a climaxing faith and a prophetic experience are in the line of gospel promise to receive new impulses, as also new unfoldings, of the truth, once for all, delivered to the saints. St. John seemed to have that in view when he declared: "Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things;" to which St. Paul adds: "God hath revealed it unto us by His Spirit."

There seem now two main points from which we may study the mysticism of the New Testament. First, from the point of personal religious experience, intensively developed; second, from the point of an individual pas-sional illumination concerning the higher contacts of the gospel on the divine side, perhaps in a sense kindred to that indicated by St. Paul in his references to "the heavenlies." That phrase, which is used only in the Epistle to the Ephesians, itself a chart of the spiritual universe, carries a far deeper locative meaning than is discerned by the ordinary reader. These "heavenlies" are located equally in the seen and unseen spheres of experience; they are subjective and objective; they are mystical in sense in which we are finding the New Testament term to stand.

The bearing of the definitely located "heavenlies" on the future of Christian reali-

zation is of a value that cannot now be adequately appraised. It will obtain as a reaction from the present raging rationalistic humanism which must end in a subsidence into atheism like the eighteenth century's aftermath of Deism. By the middle of the twentieth century, Christian thought will rebound from this debacle, as it did, in the nineteenth century, from Deism. Within a decade, the schools and the pulpits will begin to swing back to the miraculous doctrines of the gospel, the realm of true mysticism in faith and life. The signs pointing thereto are not to be discounted.

It is most difficult to preach a doctrine like this to an age like ours, an age intellectually nervous, and suspicious of spiritual fact and phenomena. But the gospel loses its meaning if we consider it as having ceased to function in those divine atmospheres and relationships in which it originated. The power which was manifested in the Galilean miracles, and which attended the apostolic mission, has not been qualified, neither will it be removed from the church so long as the church remains in the waiting attitude of the pre-Pentecostal vigil.

The more apparent aspects, that is the more material aspects, of miracles, as sound Christian judgment allows, passed with the close of the apostolic age; but, according to the Master's promise, a no less real manifest of miracles perpetually obtains in the victories achieved through the gospel. The multitudes healed in Galilee have become multitudes of multitude that no man can number, healed through the ministries promoted by the gospel. The marvel of three thousand converted on the day of Pentecost has been reduplicated a thousand times for every day of centuries without number.

Christian men have committed a breach of faith in allowing that any quality or degree of the divine power which introduced the gospel into the world has been withheld from it. This is the basis of the true mysticism, which is only another name for that "wisdom of God in a mystery" whose terms continually recur in the preaching of St. Paul and which climaxes in the confidence: "The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirits that we are the children of God."

In a search for the records of Christian mysticism, nothing could be more logical than to begin, as we have, with the experience of St. Paul. As argued in a former paper, that experience starts in a conversion not differing in elemental consciousness from that of the thief

on the cross. The conversion of each issued in the new birth, which also was the state of those infantile saints which the apostle afterwards knew at Corinth. But the Damascus experience of Saul was conversion plus personality, rabbinical good conscience and a capacity to receive the heavenly vision.

Given the convergence of the Messianic impact and the Tarsian consciousness, the vision of Saul is forever possible of repetition. But both the impact and the response are collaterals of a mystery of power which outreaches the concepts of human philosophy.

Again, this identifies the sphere of the true mysticism, later attested by the apostle himself. Crises and conjunctions, relatively as important as those which overwhelmed the Pharisee in the way, may occur in future stages of gospel development. A like response would enter the same realm of mystery, and emerge therefrom with the same enduements, albeit

with a variant of manifestation. Power takes to itself a manifold expression.

The three year retreat of St. Paul to Arabia (a period whose length seems settled by his own account of it) developed lines of both experience and revelation. Not only was his personal faith deepened and illuminated; but most exalting theophanies were vouchsafed him. These went to the end of gospel truth, from the *Kenosis* to the Ascension. It is most likely that, during this period, St. Paul was caught up into the third heaven and heard a speech unlawful to be uttered of men. Also, it was then that he saw the Christ in the same bodily form in which he was seen by the eleven in the pre-Ascension days. Millions have seen the Christ in a reality made possible through "the wisdom of God in a mystery." This is the faith and revelation of New Testament mysticism.

*Nashville, Tennessee.*

## Current Scientific Discoveries

BY PROFESSOR GEORGE MCCREADY PRICE, A.M.

### The Alleged Evolution of the Horse

**D**R. WILLIAM DILLER MATTHEW, one of the leading vertebrate paleontologists of the world, died last September, being then the head of the department of geology in the University of California. He had formerly been connected with the American Museum of Natural History, New York City.

As Dr. Matthew and I happened to be born in the same province of Eastern Canada within a year of each other, and as I was somewhat acquainted with his father, who was an amateur geologist of some note and who rendered me valuable assistance in my first struggles with this science, I had followed Dr. Matthew's career with much interest, and had had several interviews with him. My respect for him as a man will not, however, stand in the way of my criticizing some of his theories and his teachings.

Most of Dr. Matthew's publications were of a highly technical character. But he has become famous for one on *The Evolution of the*

*Horse*, which has been widely circulated as one of the guide-books used by visitors to the American Museum of Natural History, New York, and which has been very extensively copied in all sorts of scientific works advocating the evolution theory, the illustrations accompanying the text-matter being supposed to be objective evidence of the development of the modern horse from a small three-four toed animal called "Eohippus," which it is claimed was the direct ancestor of our modern large, one-toed horse, the scientific name of which is *Equus*.

In various ones of my books I have discussed this subject in some detail, and have pointed out the fact that this series of so-called "horses" in an alleged vertical or historical sequence, is a purely artificial affair, having been made up from widely-scattered fossil skeletons which could very reasonably have all lived contemporary with one another; for the modern horse, *Equus caballus*, is found in the fossil form both in North America and in the Old World. There



is absolutely no scientific reason for arranging these various fossil "horses" in a supposed historical series from the little to the big, and from the four-toed to the one-toed, except the desire to illustrate the theory of organic evolution. It is evolutionary propaganda, that is all.

Without going into all the technical details of this subject, I may be permitted to point out here the further important fact that this little "Eohippus" was more like a tapir than a horse, the molar teeth being almost identical. It is only by a figure of speech that this little animal about the size of a fox, with four toes on its front feet and three on its hind feet, can be called a "horse." It was no more a horse than a tapir is a horse or than the hippopotamus is a pig.

It is high time that the misleading diagrams and exhibits shown in all the museums to "illustrate" the evolution of such animals as the horses, the elephants, and the camels, be honestly explained to the public. If all the actual facts were known by the public at large, there would be far less confidence in the evolution theory than now prevails. And an honest statement of these many suppressed facts would at least give the unsophisticated public a chance to form their own opinion. As it is now, the dogmatism of extremely theoretical schemes of alleged "descent" among the various fossils are paraded before the public as the only scientific views on these points.

In conclusion, I may say that Dr. Matthew was not an extreme advocate of the descent theory. He himself protested among his colleagues at the use made of some of these facts about the fossils. He always stood out against the "phylogenetic method," which would include in a "phylum" all the "earliest" and little-differentiated fossils that by any remote possibility can be supposed to have been "ancestral" to the "later" and more highly differentiated forms. His view was that the fossils ought to be grouped into natural or "horizontal" groups, and let the evolutionary pedigrees of the various kinds take care of themselves. He was also opposed to the highly fanciful "land-bridges" theory of many geologists, by which they sought to explain the geographical distribution of the various animals and plants.

A little knowledge of geology inclineth men's minds to evolution; but depth of knowledge in this science bringeth men's minds back to the Bible—to adapt somewhat the famous words of Francis Bacon.

## Scraps

By George McCready Price

Most Fundamentalists know that Mendelism has thrown the Darwinian camp into confusion, so that they don't know what to do. It has also cleared up some points on which believers in the Bible were astray; for it has shown how the great variety of living animals and plants can be easily accounted for as the descendants of comparatively few kinds which were preserved from the Flood.

To me it seems that the recent discoveries in physics and astronomy which may be grouped together under the name of "*quanta phenomena*" are destined to clear up many points regarding the manner in which the great Jehovah is conducting the work of *caring for his universe*. The old materialism, or the mechanistic philosophy, seems to be eliminated entirely, as is being pointed out by Sir A. S. Eddington and Sir James H. Jeans and other writers. Christians have long known that the old Deistic view of an absentee God, Who had started the universe and is now letting it run itself, must be wrong; but we couldn't prove it scientifically. Now the New Physics is doing this for us.

God has not delegated His powers to the electrons and the protons. The suns, the galaxies, and the super-galaxies are none of them running on their own inherent energies. They are none of them self-acting. From the most minute to the largest, all the material objects in the universe seem to be momentarily and continuously conducted by the fiat or directly-acting Word of that Mind Whom we as Christians worship under the endearing title of Our Father Who is in Heaven. This the "*quanta phenomena*" of the New Physics and the New Astronomy are illustrating for us. More will be given about this subject at some later time.

\* \* \*

A research laboratory may be defined as a place where inquisitive persons ask impertinent questions of the Ruler of the universe,—and usually get them answered.

\* \* \*

The geologists who accompanied the two most recent expeditions to the South Pole are making some scientific reports about their findings there which are very unwelcome to the old stand-pat believers in the "ice-age" theory.

Everybody knows that the most extensive glaciers in the world are in the south, around the south polar regions. Well, these men who have been examining these glaciers are now reporting that these great sheets of ice "exercise a conservative influence" on the land-surfaces beneath them; for the ice seems to *protect* the land, not to erode it or to dig out great lakes in it.

How long before such facts will get into the

school textbooks? Probably a good many years. But the old fables of a great ice-sheet covering most of North America and another similar one over northwestern Europe, ought to be banished from all respectable science. For there are no traces of any such ice-sheets throughout Siberia, which is today the coldest part of the world. And now we learn that the land-ice of the Antarctic actually protects the underlying land-surfaces.

## The Church in Europe

BY FREDERICK HASSKARL, M.A., B.D.

### "The Good Samaritan of Germany"

**I**MMANUEL Kant died A.D., 1804; Wolfgang von Goethe, 1832. Frederick Schliermacher, 1834. Rationalism was "agog" as is our American form, called "Modernism," just one hundred years later. Two high school boys had been discussing the subject. They separated. One of them was walking slowly through the famous "Brandenburger Tor," Berlin, Germany. He looked up into the starlit heavens and said to himself: "You cannot believe that this vast space in which the stars regularly run their course, has an end. And you cannot conceive of the endlessness of space either. When then in these material things the relation of the finite remains to you a riddle over against the infinite, how can you grasp with your mind the mysteries of the Kingdom of Grace and of the Spirit?" These thoughts went through the mind of a fourteen year old boy!

Eight years later this same boy of German nobility, was sent from an estate into the village to hire laborers to help reap the harvest. It was a week-day. However, it happened to be the "Foreign Mission Festival." The village was as though deserted. All were in Church. The twenty-two year old boy naturally entered the Church. The pastor was preaching on the theme of Salvation: "Thousands are perishing without the knowledge of the Saviour. Is there not one at least in this vast audience willing to obey the Command of Christ and to enter His service, as a laborer in His Harvest?" The answer was clearly, "Yes, Pastor, here I am."

The fourteen year old boy and the young man of twenty-two was Frederick von Bodelschwingh, "The Good Samaritan of Germany." This month Germany is commemorating the One-Hundredth Anniversary of his birth. He was born March 6, 1831, and entered the Life April 2, 1910, in his eightieth year. A recent American writer says of him, "When he was called to his reward his life of love and labor had helpfully touched almost every phase of human distress and had inspired Christians and philanthropists in every part of the civilized world."

What great task had he accomplished? In 1872, he received a call to Bielefeld, to be the pastor and housefather of two modest institutions, "Bethel," a single building for epileptics, "Sarepta," a small motherhouse for deaconesses. At the time of his death, the largest colony of Christian mercy in the world had been established! The Rev. E. F. Bachmann, D.D., the well-known head of the Mary J. Drexel Motherhouse of Deaconesses in Philadelphia, wrote recently after a trip to Bielefeld:

At present more than 2,000 epileptics are here at home. Gradually, others were included in this ministering love,—mental patients, utterly destitute, homeless and helpless persons, consumptives, and by no means least, the "brethern of the road" as Pastor Von Bodelschwingh called tramps, victims of alcoholism and youths difficult to train. About 600 healthy children and young people attend the various schools; students pursue regular theological studies on a par with university courses, and candidates for the ministry divide their time between actual care of epileptics and the study of theological and social



problems. Then there were 1,800 sisters connected with the Motherhouse, 300 volunteer helpers, and 600 "brothers" or deacons, a grand total of about eight thousand persons. Many of these sisters and brothers serve in various parts of Germany and abroad; and fifty missionaries, doctors, deaconesses and helpers have been sent to the "Bethel" Mission in East Africa. Truly, here is a "city of love," a "Palestine in Germany," because every one of the 150 important houses bears a significant Biblical name, for example, the last station for epileptic men, helpless cripples, awaiting their call to enter the Promised Land, is "Nebo."

Many a stranger has wandered into Bielefeld, not knowing that it was a "City of God," until he met the inhabitants and realized at once: Here the Lord Jesus reigns supremely!

What was and still is the power back of all this? There is but one answer: Jesus Christ of Holy Scriptures. It is not necessary to state that Pastor Friedrich von Bodelschwingh enjoyed the highest scholastic education that Germany has to offer. This is self-evident. His forbears were of the nobility.

His father and mother belonged to the large von Bodelschwingh family tree. Both were devout evangelical Christians. The mother was a woman of great gifts, noted for her simplicity and piety. The father was a high statesman of Prussia, who personally instructed his children in Martin Luther's Catechism. Christ reigned in this von Bodelschwingh family. A brilliant career lay before this talented young man of German nobility. He became a humble pastor—and as I read years ago in English, "The greatest human benefactor of the nineteenth century," and in German, "The Lord Jesus' good Samaritan."

To him Holy Scriptures were the Word of God. In a sense he knew it verbatim. His well-known greetings were couched in Its words. All difficulties were solved by it. All joys found a word from this revelation of God on his lips. He gloried in preaching and explaining it. Christians of every color and clime came to hear him and to see the great works the Saviour, Whom he worshipped, wrought through him. Because he communed with the King of Kings, he was at ease in the presence of European royalty. Because he walked with Him, Who said, "Whatsoever ye do unto the least of these my brethren ye do unto me," he could sit all night at the bed-side of a "brother of the road." Because he lived already in this life the eternal life he would have subscribed to the words of Browning:

All service ranks the same with God,  
There is no last nor first.

Friedrich von Bodelschwingh was intensely

practical. Many thousand were to be fed. Besides the ever-flowing gifts of Christian love he acquired hundreds of acres of bad land and turned them into a veritable paradise of fruitfulness. He had mastered the most modern German methods of agriculture. Dr. Bachmann writes: "He actually turned the barren soil upside down, bringing to the top a rich loam found about three to six feet below the surface."

He never used a trick to obtain a "Pfennig." It had to come forth for Christ's sake. Andrew Carnegie was greatly impressed by Bodelschwingh's stupendous work, yet due to certain stipulations, he felt it necessary to refuse a large gift. When certain members of the Reichstag wanted the German Empire to subsidize certain features of his work of love, he opposed it.

He had no faith in the modern de-Christianized social service. He saw little of helpfulness in assisting "the less fortunate human beings" just simply because they were less fortunate and human. His Christ-centered faith rested in *die innere Mission* (inner Mission). It was Christ first and foremost, the good Samaritan. He had a burning passion to reach the inner of man, his soul. He saw in every human being, in the very worst, a Child of God,—if only the Lord Jesus could do His redemptive work! There are thousands living today who are witnesses of the Redemption, which Christ worked in them through the inner mission of Pastor von Bodelschwingh.

His sons are pastors. Paul was his successor, but was soon called into the Life. Friedrich is now in charge of Bielefeld. On his death bed,—due to a stroke of apoplexy—he could not speak. The family gathered around him. One son said, "Father, if you understand me, press my hand." The father pressed his hand strongly. Then the son relates:

So then we could speak to him and commend his soul into the Saviour's hands. For his and our comfort, we quoted aloud the great Words of comfort from God's Holy Word. The last word that caused him to press my hand was: "Fear not, for I have redeemed thee." Then his hand sought my head and rested upon it, as though he would bless me. Thereupon, he raised his index finger high up, as though he would say, "Thither I go. Thither shall you all go!"

A great soul left the Church Militant to join the Church Triumphant, a witness to the eternal truth of the Son of God:

He that abideth in me, and I in Him, the same bringeth forth much fruit, for without me, ye can do nothing.

Wilmington, Delaware.

## For Your Scrap Book

REVEREND A. WALLACE COPPER, A.B.

### Michelangelo<sup>1</sup>

**W**HAT inspiration came to that thirteen-year-old Michelangelo to take it into his head to be a painter when all fathers wanted their sons to be merchants? When he first began to paint his father swore at him. He did not want his son to be a painter. What future was there in painting? Finally his father consented to such a life work and took him to a master who later proved to be jealous of his student. He would advertise the boy's paintings as a "studio piece," meaning that the master had a share in it, and thus it appeared less remarkable. No one would be aware of the genius of his precocious artist. However, it was fortunate for young Michelangelo that he came under the influence of Lorenzo de' Medici.

When he was twenty-six years of age Florence recognized him as a great artist. The cardinal in Siena ordered fifteen life-sized statues made within a period of three years. Michelangelo noticed in the yard adjoining the Cathedral a large block of marble. It had been there for forty years. What did he care for a contract with the cardinal? He took his chisel and began to carve. Two and a half years passed, and the city was amazed. Never had they seen such a large statue. They called it "The giant," but Michelangelo called it "David." Where could they place it? It was decided to erect it in front of the Signoria. It took four days to transport it, and every night envious artists attempted to destroy it and would have done so but for the city guards. What a gala day when it was finally erected. So significant was it that the Florentines began to reckon time as so many years after the giant was set up.

Where did Michelangelo live while he carved "David"? In a hut in the Cathedral yard. Who lived with him? A man twenty years his senior, Leonardo da Vinci.

Raphael was jealous of Michelangelo. He was better with the brush while the young producer of "David" was matchless with the chisel.

However, Raphael could handle the pope and in his desire to ruin the reputation of his competitor, knowing Michelangelo was not superior with the brush, persuaded the pope to offer him the opportunity to paint the walls of the Sistine Chapel. Michelangelo was terrified and claimed Raphael should do it. The pope insisted. He was to paint the twelve apostles. Scarcely had he finished the first picture when it started to mildew. The pope sent two men to show him how to fresco. Michelangelo locked them out of the chapel. In it he stayed for four years. Day and night he was up on the scaffold working. From time to time the pope would come in and shout, "When will it be finished?" The great master would shout down from the scaffold, "When I am satisfied with it." Finally it was finished. Satisfied at last. There on that ceiling are figures so compelling that all Christendom has learned to believe in them as in the scripture and even the great skeptics of the world have bowed their heads before the vision.

Michelangelo never worked from a model and only occasionally from a cadaver. He always created the heads and faces out of his own thoughts, so that the great galaxy of figures in marble and paint rarely have a counterpart among living men.

The great master was not always pleased with his career. He had his discouragements. When the heirs of Pope Julius II renewed the attacks and called him a thief he distressingly said, "Painting and sculpture, work and loyalty, have ruined me. Had I as a boy learned to make matches, I should be more at peace today." However, he was loyal to his work. From his sixty-first to sixty-seventh years he painted "The Last Judgment" on the altar wall of the Sistine Chapel.

He really had no youth, for he always lived with men. It was not until his sixty-third year that he met Vittoria Colonna, and to that fifty-year-old, cultured kindly widow, he poured out his soul. But he was not used to women. His life had been lived without them. One day Vittoria became ill and passed away. In confidence to a friend he said, "I have lost a

<sup>1</sup>Michelangelo—Ludwig.



great friend. Nothing hurts me more than to remember that on her death bed I kissed her hand and not her lips." Michelangelo was not at home with men. No, when there was any trouble he fled. He was only at home with marble giants, semi-gods and statues.

Who was to build the Cathedral dome? The pope summoned Michelangelo. He refused. The pope commanded and gave him the liberty to tear down anything he disliked. He did not have to give account to anyone. Michelangelo was seventy-three years of age. He agreed on one condition—no money. He declared that he did not care to argue over money. The last thing he did was to chisel the statues of Jesus and His Mother. The great master passed away, but the dome of St. Peters was completed. His plans were consummated by other hands. It is the greatest dome in all the world, and a model for thousands of others of the earth. At its feet flows the Tiber at whose source the creator of the dome was born.

### Wolfgang Goethe<sup>1</sup>

ONE afternoon Goethe and Beethoven walked out together in the Carlsbad Valley to talk at ease. Everywhere, as they walked, passers-by saluted them, pointed them out and bowed with ostentatious deference. "Isn't it maddening?" exclaimed Goethe. "I simply can't escape this homage." "Don't be too much distressed by it," said Beethoven, "it is just possible that some of it may be for me."

GOETHE was in Sicily. How he enjoyed it.

It was there that art and nature met in a supreme harmony. In the evening he sat amid the ruins of the antique theatre while the nightingale patterned the night with ecstatic trills and the sea rolled its dark floods to the foot of the rocks. The poet, drunk on the perfume of the roses, dreamed of a time when idealism would conquer and all would be well with the world. While in Italy he went adventuring along the Tiber, under the shade of the Villa Borghese, and wandered on the slopes of the Pincio, and idled among the ruins of the Palatinate; and among the tawny walls gilded by the sunset, half-hidden among the undergrowth, the broken columns of the Forum tumbled silent at his feet. It was true indeed the wind coming from those antique tombs was heavy with the breath of roses, and when the sun had set at last, and the Roman sky let fall its silky evening hangings of so green a blue,

the poet would wend his way back to Corso.

He had drunk his fill of sun and beauty, truth and pleasure. It was with reluctance he said good-bye to the capital where the statues of Marcus Aurelius still rose goldenly from the shadows of the past; good-bye to the Colosseum, dreaming in the moonlight. No wonder he could say, "I feel as if I have at last found peace, found it this time for life." Why could he not say it? He had wandered across the Forum, paced up and down in front the ruined palaces, and wandered around the Colosseum. The Roman phoenix rose again from the ashes; all antiquity surged up from its tomb and Goethe himself came back to life with it.

GOETHE loved Schiller. When Schiller had passed away no one wanted to tell Goethe. One day he said to his faithful Christina, "Tell me, wasn't Schiller very ill last evening?" His tone was so miserable that she burst into sobs. "He is dead," cried Goethe, and bowing his head as if she had struck him, hid his face in his hands. They asked him if he wanted to see his friend before he lay in the coffin. "No," cried Goethe, "never." He was so crushed that he could not attend the funeral service. He finally said, "I have just lost half of myself."

Goethe sent for Schiller's unfinished manuscripts. He wanted to finish them and give them to the world. So great was his love for Schiller that years after when Napoleon had conquered the kingdom he said to Goethe, "I know you are the greatest tragic poet in Germany." The great, stalwart poet looked at the little Corsican and said, "You do our country an injustice. Have you not heard of Schiller?" It so impressed Napoleon that after they had parted he said of Goethe to his friends, "There goes a man."

The night of the twenty-first of March, Goethe, weakened by fever, installed himself in his armchair and ordered his daughter-in-law and servants to go and rest. He sank into a stupor, grew feebler but awoke toward sunrise. He said to Odila, "What day is it?" She informed him it was the twenty-second day of March. "Good, the springtime has begun," cried Goethe. A few minutes later he expired. Yes, an immortal springtime had begun.

\* \* \*

The American Institute of Accounts, after careful investigation, concludes that since the war three billion dollars have been stolen from the American public through the sale of spurious securities.—*Stewart Chase.*

<sup>1</sup>Goethe—Jean Marie Carre.

# Young People's Department

REVEREND HAROLD JOHN OCKENGA

Topic for April 5, 1931

## What does the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man Mean?

BY H. J. OCKENGA, B. A.,

Scripture: John 8:31-46.

**MY FATHER!** Who is He? There are several current ideas very prevalent today about the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. We hear a great deal about the love and mercy of God toward us but very little about His justice. The late G. Studdart Kennedy, formerly King's Bishop, said that God must be either Infinite or Good, but He could not be both since suffering is in the world: if He were good and Infinite, He would do away with suffering. Hence he believed that God was Good, but not Infinite.

The same lopsided view has been taken of God's justice and His mercy. The justice has been sacrificed for the mercy because of some difficulty in thought.

We are told that God is the Father of all men and that all we need to do is to appropriate our privileges of sonship. This is the same claim that the Jews made in the forty-first verse of our Scripture. They said, "We have one Father, even God."

Another current idea is that of the brotherhood of man. Equality, fraternity, and liberty are being stressed. Though true enough in relation to the generic man, brotherhood is not true of all men religiously. We are told that we are all in the same boat and we're crossing the same stream of life. Or we are told that we may be taking different pathways but that we are going to the same place. Hence whether we are Hindus, Mohammedans, or Christians we are all brothers. There is no greater falsehood than this.

Again we are hearing on every hand that Christ is our example, that He was the One who perfectly appropriated His privileges of sonship. All we have to do is to follow in His footsteps, to experience the same religion He did, and we shall rise to our privileges as sons of God. Another great falsehood is this. Jesus said, "Your Father, and my Father," "Ye are of your Father, the devil."

Furthermore, if we did become like Christ we should not win the world, as it is claimed, by that alone. Jesus Himself was hated, rejected, and killed. The servant is not greater than the Master. If they did this to Him, what will they do to us?

### What family are you in?

(1) There are only two families—God's and Satan's. These two classes are clearly delineated in the Bible. From Genesis to Revelation there are: the Godly and the ungodly, the saved and the lost, the redeemed and the unredeemed, the righteous and the

unrighteous, those like Jesus Christ and those not like Jesus Christ, the children of God and the children of the devil (Ps. 1; Rev. 22:11-12). Jesus said, "If Abraham were your father, ye would do the works of Abraham."

Abraham was a man of *faith*. By faith he obeyed, by faith he sojourned in a land while looking for a city that hath foundations whose maker and builder is God, by faith he received promises and Isaac was born, by faith he offered Isaac up in sacrifice, believing that God would raise him from the dead (Heb. 11:18-19).

Abraham was a man of *prayer*. We read in Genesis 18 that God would not hide anything that he was to do from Abraham, for Abraham was in fellowship with God. We receive a great illustration of this in Abraham's intercession for Lot and the lost cities of Sodom and Gomorrah.

If these Jews who believed on Jesus intellectually were truly the sons of Abraham and thus the sons of God, they would have done Abraham's works which were notably lacking in their lives. Instead of doing Abraham's works they were doing the works of their father, the Devil—the works of murder, of lust, and of lies.

And no man today who has not received Jesus as the Son of God and who is not doing the works of a son of God in faith can consider God as his Father or Christians as his brethren.

(2) Why are there only two families? It is because God only had two children, Adam the first creation, and Jesus Christ the second Adam. "The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterwards that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth earthy, the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly" (I Cor. 15:45-48).

Adam was created perfect, as God's son, but through conscious sin was alienated from Him. Through him we are all sinners by the inheritance of his fallen nature. Jesus Christ was created sinless and He remained sinless (John 8:46). Through Him, by the new birth, we become the children of God and inherit His righteousness.

The Scripture identifies the children of Adam naturally with the children of Satan, for he is the prince of this world and those of the world are in his power (John 12:31; 14:30; I John 5:19; I John 1:7; 1:9; Rom. 3:22, 23; Jer. 9:17).

### How long will you stay there?

(1) As clearly as the Scripture includes all naturally in the family of the Devil, just so clearly it provides a way out. (The one exception to the statement that all are the children of the Devil, concerns the children of the Covenant, that is, those born of



Christian parents. We also leave children of unbelievers dying in infancy to the mercy of God for the Scripture says nothing about them). Some people are blind both to the fact that they are children of the devil and to the fact that there is a way out. But the invitation to leave Satan's family is plain. (Read Is. 1:18; Matt. 11:28; Rom. 5:6; John 6:37; I Peter 1:18; John 1:29).

The way out is through Jesus Christ. He was God's Atonement, opening the door. He was God's Lamb, satisfying the laws of justice, (Heb. 13:12, 14). By repentance and faith in Him, we may receive adoption into the family of God whereby we say, "Aba, Father," and whereby the spirit bears witness with our Spirit that we are the children of God (Acts 2: 28; John 1:12; Rom. 8:15, 16).

(2) The responsibility for this exodus from the family of Satan into the family of God rests upon the individual. It is your decision, your receiving, and your coming. And this is the time when the decision must be made.

### Where will you end up?

Those who remain in the family of Satan shall share Satan's end, which the Scripture says shall be in the lake which burneth with fire. In this shall be consigned the fearful, the unbelieving, the abominable, the murders, the whore-mongers, the sorcerers, the idolaters, and all liars. This is some motley, speckled bunch. But in it are the unbelievers. All parts of the lake are not as deep but they're all just as wet. This is Hell. This is what Jesus said will last as long as heaven. This Jesus said was a reality, an eternal reality which must be shunned by a decision made in this world. The experience of this place is that of the God-forsaken soul.

### Conclusion

When Jesus finished with this dissertation He said, "If ye continue in my word, ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." This is one reaction possible to this truth. We shall either accept it and become the sons of God through faith in Jesus Christ and thus be free, or we shall take a second alternative which the narrative states. The sad conclusion of the matter is that "they took up stones to cast at Him." One of these two reactions must be yours and upon it will be based your life's destiny.

### Questions

1. Why are there only two classes of people in the world? Is it possible to straddle the fence on this matter?
2. What relationship does the new birth bear to the exodus from the family of Satan? Have you experienced the new birth? (Read John 3.)
3. What proportion of the people in our churches today are like the Jews of old, believing with their heads but rejecting the truth as Christ presented it for their lives?
4. Do you feel from your reading of the Bible that this is the teaching of Jesus?
5. When we speak of race brotherhood, patriotic brotherhood, family brotherhood, what do we mean? Is it the same as Christian brotherhood?

### My Father Watches Over Me

(Contributed by FRANCES THOMAS)

I trust in God wherever I may be,  
Upon the land or on the rolling sea,

For, come what may, from day to day,  
My heavenly Father watches over me.

I trust in God,  
I know He cares for me,  
On mountain bleak,  
Or on the stormy sea;  
Tho' billows roll  
He keeps my soul,  
My heavenly Father watches over me,

He makes the rose an object of His care,  
He guides the eagle thro' the pathless air,  
And surely He remembers me,  
My heavenly Father watches over me.

I trust in God, for, in the lion's den,  
On battlefield, or in the prison pen,  
Thro' praise or blame, thro' flood or flame,  
My heavenly Father watches over me.

The valley may be dark, the shadows deep,  
But O, the Shepherd guards His lonely sheep;  
And thro' the gloom He'll lead me home,  
My heavenly Father watches over me,  
—Rev. W. C. Martin.

### If We Knew Each Other Better

(Contributed by FRANCES THOMAS)

If we knew each other better  
We would love each other more,  
For the best is often inside  
While the worst is at the door.

If we knew men's secret motives  
And their innermost intents,  
We'd have less of dark suspicion—  
More of trust and confidence.

If we knew our neighbor's burdens—  
Knew his longings and his prayers—  
We would be more sympathetic  
With his sorrows and his cares.

'Neath their superficial difference  
Men are like o'er all the earth;  
If we understood them better,  
We would realize their worth.

Black, white, brown and red and yellow—  
All can serve and all have needs;  
Color makes no slightest difference  
In the worth of kindly deeds.

When there's call for heroism  
And for noble sacrifice,  
There's no test of birth or language—  
Men of every race arise.

When help comes in time of trouble  
Or deep sympathy in grief,  
We ask not the race or color  
Of the one who brings relief.

Kindness is its own credential—  
Love—it's own certificate;  
Good-will breaks down every barrier,  
Opens every closed gate.

If, as men, and if, as nations,  
Each by each were understood,  
There could be no strife or hatred—  
Earth would be one brotherhood.

—Clyde Lement Hay.

This understanding will only come as men accept Christ and see Him in their fellowmen.

### Topic for April 12, 1931

### What does the Gospel Mean?

LYNN S. MOSSER

Scripture: I Cor. 15:13; Rom. 3:10-28; II Kings 5.

### Introduction

THE Gospel is the message of God concerning His salvation. Men have a controversy with Him.

They are dwelling far from Zion. They have even broken the fundamental law of the land,—The law of holiness. The Gospel is God's message of reconciliation. It is the way now open to all who will return to the heavenly city. It is the covenant through which Divine Majesty pardons all transgressions of His law. The central truth of this message is "that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures" (I Cor. 15:13). The following points are essential characteristics of this message.

### The Gospel is the Prescription of God

The race is spiritually very sick. But not because of neglect on the part of its Physician. He has carefully diagnosed the case and prescribed accordingly. God's prescription for a diseased people is the Gospel of Grace. It is the only way to spiritual and moral health, yet many prefer to remain sickly and in continuous infirmity. Every day there are reported severe cases of hatred, uncleanness, drunkenness, fornication, thieving, adultery, and other maladies, some of which cannot even be named.

Now, the Giver of Life says Himself that "they that are whole have no need of the physician, but they that are sick; I came not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance" (Mark 2: 17). He alone can heal. Yet, as usual, the market is crowded with patent medicines, youthful doctrines, and loud-mouthed quacks who promise much and most often only aggravate the disease and leave their patient the worse for their treatment.

There are many remedies which have for thousands of years been known to successfully relieve pain and outwardly heal. Many of these patients will testify, however, that although they were externally plastered and patched by these age old remedies, inward ulcers continued to mar and corrupt their spiritual health until finally they despaired of ever being cured. But is the Physician to be blamed for the desperate sickness of His patient if he steadfastly refuses to take the prescription freely offered him? It is either bathe in the Jordan like a certain Syrian general or live and die the life and death of a leper (See II Kings, Ch. 5).

### The Gospel is the Power of God

But the Gospel is more than a group of doctrines or a book of directions. If we should find a man in a deep pit, a lecture on various methods of getting out of his dilemma would do him little good. The salvation of the man comes when we bring him the rope and lower it to him and then he climbs to liberty.

"Mankind is, as it were, at the bottom of an abyss; the preaching of the Gospel is the Power from above which raises the race out of it" (F. Godet's *Commentary on Romans*). The Gospel, when accepted by man, immediately saves him.

The Salvation is the power of God in two ways. "On the one side, deliverance from an evil, perdition; on the other, communication of a blessing, eternal life in communion with God" (F. Godet). It is in this sense that a man who accepts Christ and trusts in Him as his Saviour soon finds that a work has begun in his soul that fights forever any disease or sinful corruptions that may linger there.

We sing, "He breaks the power of cancelled sin," and so He does. Christ, the Gospel of God, is in the Evangelists the Power of God also.

He says of Himself, "He hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of the sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised" (Luke 4:18).

So Christian, struggling under the load of his sin, at the sight of the cross suddenly found himself released and free. But not only were the sins against God forever pardoned, in the case of this great character of John Bunyan, but he was given power and assistance to walk in the Way of Life even until he reached the Celestial City.

### The Gospel is the Pathway of God

On the King's highway there is peace and security. Along this way the traveller is sure to find congenial companions, good food, and Providential care. It is true that this road is often rough, steep, and even hard, but the Lord has sent forth "ministering spirits to them who are the heirs of Salvation." There are many easier highways and paths that even "butt down" upon the way of life, but these are found almost always to be blind alleys or else lead the Christian into bogs and swamps which are as notorious for their filthy mire as they are for their terrible fevers.

The Gospel is, therefore, the pathway along which God's man journeys. Powerful electric currents must have good conducting wires or the current is either entirely lost or badly dissipated. The Word of God is the wire along which spiritual strength and awakening comes. "The Holy Spirit's power proceeds along the line of the Word of God as the electric message along the wires" (F. B. Meyer).

The Apostle has put it graphically in Romans 10:17, "Therefore belief cometh by hearing and hearing by the Word of God." The Word is the vehicle which carries in its bosom living power and spiritual nutrition. The Word of God is, as it were, a truck into which is loaded precious foodstuffs for the hungry army.

The Word is also likened to His seed. Every seed has within itself power to spring into a mighty oak or a beautiful plant. It may be asked, "What plants have arisen from the seed which has been cast into the ground? This clearly implies that while all seeds do not germinate into plants, yet a plant never arises but from a seed" (Thomas Chalmers).

### Questions

1. Find out what essential actions were necessary on the part of Naaman before he was cleansed from his leprosy? II Kings 5. What is leprosy a type of in the Bible?
2. In Romans 3 what is the nature of man? What did the law do for him? What did the Gospel? What is the Gospel? See Romans 10:9-16. Why does the Gospel mean good news?
3. Has the Good News meant anything to your life? Have you found deliverance through it? Is the News worth passing on? Are you passing it on?

### Books

Pilgrim's Progress, by John Bunyan.

(Contributed by FRANCES THOMAS)

There is a fountain filled with blood,  
Drawn from Immanuel's veins;  
And sinners, plunged beneath that flood,  
Lose all their guilty stains.



The dying thief rejoiced to see  
That fountain in his day;  
And there may I, though vile as he,  
Wash all my sins away.

Dear dying Lamb! thy precious blood  
Shall never lose its power,  
Till all the ransomed church of God  
Be saved, to sin no more.

E'er since, by faith, I saw the stream  
Thy flowing wounds supply,  
Redeeming love has been my theme,  
And shall be till I die.

Then in a nobler, sweeter song,  
I'll sing thy power to save,  
When this poor lisping, stammering tongue  
Lies silent in the grave.

—William Cowper.

"Come unto me, ye weary,  
And I will give you rest."  
O blessed voice of Jesus,  
Which comes to hearts oppressed!  
It tells of benediction,  
Of pardon, grace, and peace,  
Of joy that hath no ending,  
Of love which cannot cease.

"Come unto me, dear children,  
And I will give you light!"  
O loving voice of Jesus,  
Which comes to cheer the night!  
Our hearts were filled with sadness,  
And we had lost our way,  
But morning brings us gladness,  
And songs the break of day.

"Come unto me, ye fainting,  
And I will give you life."  
O cheering voice of Jesus,  
Which comes to aid our strife!  
The foe is stern and eager,  
The fight is fierce and long;  
But thou has made us mighty,  
And stronger than the strong.

"And whosoever cometh,  
I will not cast him out."  
O welcome voice of Jesus,  
Which drives away our doubt!  
Which calls us, very sinners,  
Unworthy though we be  
Of love so free and boundless,  
To come, dear Lord, to thee.

—William C. Dix.

## Topic for April 19, 1931

### What does Faith Mean?

EARL E. ALLEN

Scripture: Heb. 11; Rom. 3:28; 5:1; I Cor. 5:7; I John 5:4.

#### Introduction

ALL about us men are groping in the unsatisfying fog of religious uncertainty. Religious fads multiply apace as men deny the reality of faith in God the Father, whom Jesus worshipped and made manifest (John 1:14). The attitude of faith is the natural attitude of the little child to whom the unsettling influence of doubt has not come.

But the little child puts his chubby hand on the hot radiator and withdraws it with a cry of pain. Experience is teaching him that he cannot trust everything, that he cannot give himself over to everything without first investigating. Thus doubt comes into his life.

In so far as doubt serves as a warning to shun the evil and to appropriate the good it is helpful; in so far as it captures the whole personality and does not make faith stronger and more true it is a curse.

Constantly confronted as we are with the disastrous habit of living by sight instead of by faith, we, as young folk, want to know the meaning of faith, want to know this only true way out of the fog in which many are wandering.

#### Faith means Trust

The world advances as men trust each other; the current of the world's progress halts and retreats when distrust thrives. Business moves with trust and stops with distrust. Every "greenback" which we have in our purses is only a promise to pay a specified sum in silver. We exchange these notes as if they were silver because we trust the government which issued them.

Religious faith, with which we are concerned, is trust, and trust is the basis of confidence or belief. Faith is trust in the world in which we live, trust that this is God's world, the best kind of a world for the growth of Christian character.

By Christian Faith we sometimes mean the Great doctrines of the Bible. Without these objective doctrines there could be no subjective belief or faith. Christian faith is trust in Jesus as God's Redeemer of lost men and as God's Ambassador of salvation and hope and good cheer to a world enmeshed in a hopeless tangle of sinful selfishness and greed. It is a trust in this Individual and in His Saving work for our Redemption. It is trust in Christian people who are producing the fruit of the Spirit (see Gal. 5:22, 23) in their everyday relationships of life, a trust in these workers of righteousness which enters into active co-operation with them for the transformation of life.

Faith for the Christian is trust in God the Heavenly Father, whose boundless love, brought close through Jesus Christ (II Cor. 5:16, 17), sends his children to the training school of earthly experience to develop character, and "it doth not yet appear what they shall be." This faith of trust is a constant fellowship with God which wills and seeks to do his good pleasure.

#### Faith means Assurance

Faith is not timidity which withdraws from the challenging struggle for the overthrow of evil. Faith is the assurance that "all things work together for good to them that love God," that God is more than all of the unrighteous antagonism which the evil forces of the world can muster.

Back in the days of the Reformation, Martin Luther found the assurance that his sins were forgiven and that he was commissioned of God for the great work of reforming the church. This assurance gave Luther the courage to oppose the traditional power of the corrupt Roman Church and the religious stability to father Protestantism.

Faith is assurance which comes to persons who are conscious of their own weakness but whose weakness sends them prayerfully to their knees to seek forgiveness and to seek the spiritual power which God alone can give. In the words of Dr. E. Stanley Jones, faith is "letting go and letting God." It is the assurance that God is able and ready "to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us."

#### Faith means Conviction

Doubt may be helpful in so far as it compels persons to wrestle with things as they seem to arrive

nerer to things as they are. But they who are engrossed in skepticism and doubt can never revolutionize and advance their world with a positive proclamation of the gospel of Christ. Faith, not doubt, means the conviction that will irresistibly seize men's souls and make them new creatures and new creators of righteousness in Christ Jesus.

Warneck, in his *History of Protestant Missions*, writes that the religious life of England in the early eighteenth century was fruitless because it lacked the conviction of faith. "Court amusement, theatrical plays, and witticisms combined to make Christianity ridiculous, and the fashion of the day was to be a scoffer at religion."

Blackstone, after visiting various churches during this same period, said, "I did not hear a single sermon which had in it more Christianity than the writings of Cicero, and it was impossible for me to discover whether the preacher was a follower of Confucius, Mahomet, or Christ."

About this same time the Moravian group in Europe sent out more missionaries in two decades than all the rest of the Protestant groups sent out in two centuries. This little church of the Brethern possessed the conviction of faith which alone achieves constructive spiritual triumphs.

### Faith means a Way of Living

Religion is a way of living and living by faith is close to the heart of the Christian religion. The way of faith is the way of powerful living. It is irresistible, vanquishing hostile unrighteousness and the flagrant paganism of the modern social life. The way of faith is not the way of continued rest from righteousness for those who "are at ease in Zion," but it is the way of Christian adventure which pioneers on the spiritual frontiers of Christianity's advance.

Faith means a way of living for every one of us as young people. It means that instead of the instability of chronic skepticism ours is the firm constructive force of conviction. It means that instead of shrinking apology for Christian conduct we shall with dauntless assurance hold up Christianity before the youth of our world as the only real solution for the problems of life.

Faith draws aside the night-curtain of doubting uncertainty to disclose the dawning of a new day of opportunity. It is the earnest of spiritual achievement which makes meaningful life out of human existence.

### For Further Discussion

1. Can faith be idle. Are works the natural outcome of faith? Read Rom. 4:1-8; James 2:14-26.
2. What is the difference between faith and credulity? Ought Christians to be credulous?
3. Does a scientist need to exercise faith? Do you think that the average scientist in his own field of natural science needs to exercise more or less faith than the Christian?
4. Is it possible for anyone to live wholly by fact? Why not?
5. Why do you think that we speak of different religious "faiths?"

### For Further Study

GRENFELL, Wilfred T., *A Man's Faith*

McDOWELL, Bishop William F., *Making a Personal Faith*.

MACHEN, John Gresham, *What Is Faith?* Also, *History and Faith*, in the *Princeton Theological Review* for July, 1915.

(Contributed by FRANCES THOMAS)

Faith is a living power from heaven  
That grasps the promise God hath given,  
A trust that cannot be o'erthrown,  
Fixed heartily on Christ alone.

Faith finds in Christ whate'er we need  
To save or strengthen us indeed,  
Receives the grace he sends us down,  
And makes us share his cross and crown.

Faith in the conscience worketh peace,  
And bids the mourner's weeping cease;  
By faith the children's place we claim,  
And give all honor to one name.

Faith feels the Spirit's kindling breath  
In love and hope that conquer death;  
Faith worketh hourly joy in God,  
And trusts and blesses e'en the rod.

We thank thee then, O God of heaven,  
That thou to us this faith hast given  
In Jesus Christ thy Son, who is  
Our only fount and source of bliss.  
—Petrus Herbert. Tr. by Catherine Winkworth.

### The Ancient Sage

Thou canst not prove that thou art body alone,  
Nor canst thou prove that thou art spirit alone  
Nor canst thou prove that thou art both in one,  
Thou canst not prove thou art immortal, no,  
Nor yet that thou art mortal—nay, my son,  
Thou canst not prove that I, who speak with thee,  
Am not thyself in converse with thyself,  
For nothing worthy proving can be proven,  
Nor yet disproven. Wherefore thou be wise,  
Cleave ever to the sunnier side of doubt,  
And cling to Faith beyond the forms of Faith!  
She reels not in the storm of warring words,  
She brightens at the clash of "Yes" and "No,"  
She sees the best that glimmers through the worst,  
She feels the sun is hid but for a night,  
She spies the summer through the winter bud,  
She tastes the fruit before the blossom falls,  
She hears the lark within the songless egg,  
She finds the fountain where they wailed "Mirage!"  
—Alfred Tennyson.

"Though He slay me  
Yet will I trust Him."  
—Job in the Bible

### Topic for April 26, 1931

### What Stewardship Means

ROBERT WITTY

Scripture: Matt. 25:14-31; Mal. 3:8-12.

### Introduction

THE determination of every true Christian is to do his Master's will and to further His Kingdom. To such a man possessions and personal abilities are not for selfish enjoyment; they are aids for more effective discipleship. The true Christian is no longer a self-willed egotist; he is a steward. To state this conception of stewardship two principles are necessary.

### The Two Principles of Stewardship

#### 1. We are Recipients.

First, all that we should have and should be is a trust. Judged by this principle, tithing,—a system



of giving by which one-tenth of our possessions is God's, and nine-tenths are ours,—is clearly inadequate. If tithing be sufficient, we have no further obligation after we have paid God his tenth; the remainder is ours to use without any regard for human needs.

Tithing was demanded before the law was given to Moses. Abraham paid tithes to Melchisedec when he returned from the rescue of Lot. The Aaronic Priesthood was not then in existence. Hence we who live after the law ought to at least pay tithes.

The New Testament standard of giving is not that of a tenth, but is all. Everything we possess should be at the disposal of God. He told the Rich Young Ruler to go and sell all (Matt. 19). That is not necessary for us today, but it is necessary that we are ready to sell all. The Christian must be "sold out" to everything for God—possessions, personalities, and possibilities are all laid on the altar in consecration.

Then, too, the statement that, "all that we have is given us in trust" is insufficient. For this principle implies that God gives trusts to make individual man rich, and that the largeness of the gift indicates the degree of Divine favor.

According to this idea, the millionaire not only holds a great trust but also enjoys unusual favor. This is not necessarily true. Much wealth has been amassed by schemes involving human slavery, bitter extortion, and degrading vice. To these evil practices God could not be a partner. How then could such evil gain be considered a Divine trust?

Moreover many men, although poverty stricken, are walking in God's sunlight. God gives man only native endowments and opportunities. He causes His sun to shine upon the just and unjust. He who best uses these opportunities amasses wealth which indicates human ability rather than Divine favor. Certainly we cannot accuse God by saying, "all that we have is given us in trust."

Our possessions are not trusts because God gave them to us; but because we and all things are His.

The principle—all that we should have and be is a trust—enlarges our responsibility to God and fits exactly into Jesus' teaching concerning stewardship. For example, the parable of the talents teaches that the trust given to the steward and the trust required of the steward are two different quantities. The trust required of each steward included not only the one, two, or five talents, but also an additional sum which should have been gained. This indicates that our trust includes not only those capacities and opportunities which God has given us, but also an effective use of the opportunities and a development of the capacities. In short, the trust which we hold to God is not merely His gift to us in the past, is not only what we are and have at the present time; but is essentially what we should be and should have.

## 2. We are Debtors.

Second, all that we should have and should be we owe. If man owes only that which he is and has, then it is quite possible for him to justify himself by a right use of his present possessions. But this principle increases man's responsibilities to such a load that he needs Divine assistance. This does not rob man of hope; it places his hope in God rather than himself.

At the same time the parable of the talents not only teaches that the steward possesses a trust, but

emphasizes the fact that this trust can be accomplished only by having all its elements in active and proper use. In other words to fulfill this trust,—to be all and to have all that is required,—it is necessary that the steward should consider himself as a debt which he owes to his Master.

That which we owe to God can be paid in only one way. He needs nothing, but man needs much therefore, we give Him most when we give others most.

## Conclusion

Considered in this light, stewardship means that a compelling stimulus must dominate our use of the time, money, personality, prayers, and all else that we are and possess as loyal stewards, who to be faithful, must be judged not by what we are, but by what we might be. All fall so short that none can claim righteousness before God for his own works. Christ is our righteousness. However, our love for Him impels us to be more, and to have more of those things with which He would entrust us.

We are stewards of an ideal which God wills for us and to which we must give our all.

## Questions

1. How far reaching should a Christian's consecration be?
2. Show why tithing is inadequate. What did Jesus say concerning tithing? How far beyond tithing should the Christian go?
3. Does God give man all his possessions?
4. Is man a steward of what God gives him? Of what he now is, and has? Of what he should be, and should have?
5. Show how the statement—all that we should have and should be we owe—differs from the common attitude of the world.
6. Name some ways in which I may be a steward of my personality, my abilities, my prayers, my money, my time, my friendship.

## A Partnership

(Contributed by FRANCES THOMAS)

He had a lad for a partner,  
A boy like you or me,  
When he fed the waiting thousands  
By the Galilean sea.

A boy from the throng about him—  
Not even his name is known,  
The master chose for his partner,  
Though he might have labored alone.

He had a lad for a partner!  
May it not be today  
He still has many partners  
In many a quiet way!

Tasks done in the Master's spirit,  
With manly effort and vim,  
May it not be, they spring from  
A partnership with him!

Shall he not be our partner?  
What better firm could there be  
Through the days and years before us  
Than: The Master and Company!  
—Frances Crosby Hamlet.

\* \* \*

The sinner is the carrier of the worst of all poisonous germs.—*Southern Methodist.*

## The Pulpit

JAMES M. GRAY, D.D.

I. M. HARGETT, D.D.

ELMER ELLSWORTH HELMS, D.D.

FLOYD TOMKINS, D.D., LL.D.

MILTON HAROLD NICHOLS, D.D.

WALTER D. BUCHANAN, D.D., LL.D.

CLARENCE EDWARD MACARTNEY, D.D.

REV. CARLTON R. VANHOOK

THOMAS S. BROCK, S.T.D.

## The Rediscovery of God

ELMER ELLSWORTH HELMS, D.D.

I sought the Lord and \* \* \* he delivered me.—*Psalm 34:4.*

**N**OT a few students believe that in the Thirty-fourth Psalm David recounts his experiences while hunted and hounded by King Saul. They also believe that it probably was written while David was hiding in the Cave of Adullam from King Saul.

Think of it! A King jealous of a shepherd lad; a loyal shepherd lad who tried to serve his King and did his best to allay the evil spirit within him and to soothe his wrath by thrumming sweet music from his lyre. And King Saul flings javelins at this innocent son of the fields and sends hounds on his heels, and detectives on his tracks, and actually set an army in motion to capture him. No wonder David cried in this Psalm, "Many are the afflictions of the righteous."

Penned up in Adullam's Cave, hedged in by enemies on every hand, with only one way open, David turned that way and says, "I sought the Lord." Students insist there is an implication between the words of this Psalm that suggests, "I cried, 'O God, if there be a God.'" That need not surprise one. King Saul is blinded by one obsession, to kill David. And he is so blinded that he tried to kill his own beautiful souled son, Jonathan, solely because he raised a voice of protest; so blinded that he killed eighteen priests, because one of them gave a piece of bread to David; so blinded that he actually tried to kill his own daughter, whose only crime was trying to protect this innocent son of the sheepfold from her father's murderous jealousy. Is it any wonder that David's faith may have gone under a temporary eclipse, and that he cries, "O God, if there be a God?"

Though David may have been for the moment a questioning Thomas, he was a sincere souled Thomas, for he says, "I sought the Lord"—honestly, sincerely, truly—"and he

heard me and delivered me from all my fears." So far as David is concerned the case is proved, and with Paul he can cry, "I know whom I have believed and I know he is able to keep and able to deliver."

Referring to himself as "this poor man," he shouts, "This poor man cried and the Lord heard him and saved him out of all his troubles." "Why," he says, "I have found by experience that 'The angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear him and delivereth them,' therefore will I no longer fear what man, any man, though he be King, can do unto me." And David settles forever for his own soul and to his own satisfaction that God is, and that he is a rewarder of all them that diligently seek him. Proof? "I sought him and he heard me and delivered me, and if he would do it for me he would do it for thee."

### THE REDISCOVERY OF GOD

During the World War and for several years after we had a great revival in literature and in life of belief in a personal God and in personal immortality. But the last two years we have had a great recession that amounts to an engulfing back-wash in reference to belief in both. Of course disbelief in personal immortality naturally follows disbelief in a personal God. For belief in personal immortality is the fruit growing out of the root of belief in a personal God. Current literature, which is reflective of current life, teems with this loss of belief. In face of this it is highly proper to ask ourselves some questions.

What does the man who has severed himself from all belief in God get out of it? What are the dividends of his unbelief?

In the November '30 *American Magazine* there were two articles on the same subject—*God*—by two men whose names rank high in the world of current literature, Thomas L. Masson and W. O. Saunders. Each man choose his own sub-title for his own article: Masson,



*Faith and Contentment*; Saunders, *Doubt and Loneliness*. Saunders frankly tells us he believes in nothing—no God, no hereafter. Here are some of the sentences in his article: "I would have you meet one of the loneliest and one of the most unhappy individuals on earth—the man who doesn't believe in a personal God, to whom the grave is the end, the present is his all; he has no God to love, and no hereafter to hope for." His closing sentence is, "You have met one of the loneliest and one of the most unhappy individuals on earth—the man without a God." That doesn't sound like large dividends.

Mr. Saunders isn't alone in having cut loose from God—believing—mooings. H. G. Wells has practically repudiated the idea of a personal God. Bernard Shaw has dissolved God into "Life Force." Bertrand Russell baldly denies God's existence without the substitute of any synonym. Walter Lippman, brilliant Editor of the New York *World*, author of *A Preface to Morals*, plainly states that belief in God has simply dissolved under the "acid test of modern thought."

Henshaw Ward, in *Scribner's*, June, '30, talks glibly about *The Disappearance of God*. He takes God to the edge of the Universe and bows Him out. In the April, '30, *Forum*, Sir Arthur Keith says, "My personal God, Creator of heaven and earth, has melted away." While Harry Elmer Barnes calmly remarks, "Belief in God has disappeared into the limbo of forgotten superstitions." And Elmer Davis in a recent *Harper's* says, "Traditional belief in God has had to go overboard." Another one of our brilliant writers who used to spell God, G-O-D, now spells God, g-o-d, reducing God to a common noun.

Walter Lippman, however, proves he knows history and humanity when he says, "Some substitute must be discovered for belief in God or sheer anarchy will result." Lippman has gotten as far as they were in France more than a hundred years ago. For in those bloody and lawless times, that brilliant Frenchman exclaimed, "If there is no God somebody must invent one if France is to be saved."

This wide sweeping attitude of disbelief on the part of many literary leaders is the more amazing in view of the increasing belief in God on the part of our great scientists; these men who peer into the mysteries of the universe. Robert A. Millikan says, "If belief in God is a dream let me dream on forever."

And Dr. W. R. Whitney, former President of the American Chemical Society, Fellow of

the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, head of the Research Department of General Electric, declares he has found God in the laboratory. He further says, "The scientist who doesn't believe in God as behind all and before all would better stay out of the laboratory, for he is hopelessly lost there." He adds more, this: "Sir Oliver Lodge says everything is upborne by the all pervading ether, but Albert Einstein says there is no ether." Whitney says, "Everything is upheld by the will of God." That's his great phrase. He declares, "All things are by the will of God." That's Genesis 1:1 paraphrased by a 1930 great scientist.

That brilliant astronomer, Harlan T. Stetson, says it is too late to ask if astronomers believe in a personal God, with such a race of astronomers as—and he begins with Galileo and gives an endless list of astronomers who have believed in God. Professor Conklin, Princeton's noted biologist, says, "Nothing has been discovered in the realm of biology to warrant disbelief in God." Professor Russell, Princeton's famous astronomical scholar says like words about the discoveries of astronomy.

When Oliver Wendell Holmes said, "There is in a corner of my heart a plant called reverence," what did he mean? What does reverence imply, signify? Reverence is a godward-looking term. Reverence implies a something that God only can supply. So reverence implies and signifies belief in God. Without belief in God there can be no such thing as reverence. Reverence is the flower of faith. So when Oliver Wendell Holmes said there is in the corner of the human heart a plant called reverence, he was saying with different words that belief in God is universal.

That doesn't mean that belief in God is held or had by every man. We have a saying, "The rule is proved by the exception." It's the rule that all men are born with two hands. Yet I know a woman who was born with one hand. It's the rule that all men are born with two feet. Yet I know a man who was born with three feet. It's the rule that all men are born with two eyes. Yet I know a man who was born with no eyes. These exceptions in no way vitiate or repudiate the rule of a two-handed, two-footed, two-eyed race. You cannot gather general facts from freaks.

Nor does Oliver Wendell Holmes mean us to infer and to conclude from his statement that all men who believe in God are conscious of that belief. As was graphically stated in a recent number of the *Christian Century*, "There are men whose hunger for God is the deepest

need of their lives, but it is wholly unconscious to themselves."

Recently M. Vaughan, Editor of the Paris Daily *l' Aurore*, died. Just before his death he wrote a fellow atheist:

You know all my mature life I have disclaimed all belief in God. I am now dying and I now find I have been greatly deceived, and I have sorely deceived many. I now see that neither civilization nor soul security can be founded on atheism.

William James, that great brained thinker and writer in the realm of psychology, philosophy and kindred fields, when asked whether his belief in God was the result of argument or logical processes or deductions, answered, "Emphatically no." When pressed further for answer he reverently replied, "I need Him so that He must be." The bird needs the air so, it must be. The fish needs the water so, it must be. The eye needs the light so, it must be. The Soul needs God so He must be. "As the hart panteth after the water brooks so doth the soul after God."

The atheist says he can get along without God. So can the earthworm—after a fashion. But it ever remains an earthworm and never becomes an eagle to soar God's heavens.

And of course your atheist twits you with Job's friend's question, "Canst thou by searching find God?" "Who has ever seen God?" "No man" is the atheist's ready answer. Gilbert Chesterton likens God to the sun. Who can look at the sun? Be not deceived, no man has ever seen the sun. No eye could look on the sun and live. Yet it is in the light of the sun that we see everything. Consequences are proofs of causes. In most things we can only know causes from consequences. That's the way Newton discovered the law of gravity. That's the way William Herschel discovered the planet Neptune. For long Uranus behaved as only a planet would behave when pulled by another planet from beyond. So Herschel turned his telescope in the direction of that pull, and lo! Neptune. There is a pull from beyond. Man may be conscious of it or he may be unconscious of it, but the pull is there. That pull is God. No wonder Christ cried, "Believe in God." That belief is necessary to our very existence. It gives fashion and form to every life decision and life destiny. Emerson recognizes that belief in God settles and solves life's questions, when he shouts,

So near is grandeur to our dust,  
So near is God to man,  
When duty whispers low, "I must,"  
The soul replies, "I can."

There is a Danish fable that a spider once slid down from the high rafters of a barn on a single gossamer thread. And down in the sphere peopled by other living creatures he weaved his web, anchored to the above by that single strand. He caught flies. He grew sleek and fat. He prospered. He became worldly wise. And then one day looking at that single thread that stretched up, reached up, into the unseen, the invisible, he remarked to himself, his soul, "Now what's the use of that?" And in answer he snapped it and lo! his whole web, his whole earth house, collapsed when he broke his connection with the unseen. No wonder W. O. Saunders says, "I am the loneliest and unhappiest man on earth." So is every one who breaks connection with the unseen.

Donald Hankey, that greatest literary character of the World War, cries, "Religion is betting your life there is a God." You can stake your soul on that. You can risk your all on that. You can bring all your life questions to God. Does He really answer prayer? Try Him. Does He help in time of need? Try Him. Does He deliver from temptation? Try Him. Does He comfort in sorrow? Try Him. Can He make me a new man? "Taste and see." That's David's challenge. "Try Him," says David. "I tried Him. I sought the Lord and found Him and He delivered me." Do you want to be a free man? "He that the Son maketh free is free indeed."

The night God broke the shackles that bound the soul of John Wesley, he cried, "Now I know." We may know. We may possess that personal knowledge that will enable us to cry, "Abba, Father"—my Father, for His Spirit bears witness with mine that I am His son. I now know,

He breaks the power of canceled sin,  
He sets the prisoner free.

I know there is a sun, for I have seen its light and felt its warmth. I know there is a God. I sought Him and found Him and He delivered me.

O for a thousand tongues to sing  
My great Redeemer's praise.

\* \* \*

Be modest in speech, but excel in action.—  
*Chinese Proverb.*

\* \* \*

Faith in the hereafter is as necessary for the intellectual as for the moral character.—*Southey.*



## Library Table

CONDUCTED BY PROFESSOR LEANDER S. KEYSER, A.M., D.D.

### Teaching Sweetness and Light with a Big Club

**H**ERBERT SPENCER once declared that he could never force himself to read a book with which he thoroughly disagreed. Small wonder, then that he developed a narrow dogmatic philosophy, or that already this philosophy is only of historic interest. As for myself, I have read hundreds of books upon which I never would have spent ten minutes, if I had followed Spencer's maxim. I often find that very important truths emerge by sheer reaction against what I have been reading. Thus a bad book may become very helpful for a man disposed to write on the slightest provocation,—if the book is only bad enough.

I have just been reading such a book. Somebody sent me a copy of "Do Fundamentalists Play Fair?" It was published some five years ago, while I was away in Europe, which may partly account for the fact that I had not seen it until now. The author is a certain W. M. Forrest, who is Professor of Biblical History and Literature in the University of Virginia. A further fact develops: Professor Forrest is an ordained minister in the denomination known as Disciples, who are consistently opposed to anything like a union of Church and State. Throughout his book, also, Professor Forrest uses very pungent language against Fundamentalists for everything which he thinks shows any tendency toward mixing the church with politics. Accordingly, one naturally wonders what he is doing in teaching religious subjects in a State university.

The book is not hard to classify. It is what the logicians would call an *argumentum ad baculum*, or an appeal to the big club. Its tone is, "We've got the men and the money too," and all who don't agree with us are ignoramuses and scoundrels. But the big club is used for dramatic effect chiefly, for the author professes to want to keep peace and good feeling in the churches, and ends up on a whining note that the believers in the Bible have no right to ask the modernists to get out of the churches, even though these apostles of Tom Paine and

Ingersoll have long since repudiated every important doctrine that the church stands for.

Professor Forrest concedes that some few among the Fundamentalists are not ignorant. But he says, "Being few in number among the apostles of ignorance they are the more conspicuous. Whatever their erudition, they elect to keep their Christianity insulated from all else they know. Their ignorance is wilful" (p. 71). I suppose he would include in this number Prof. A. H. Sayce, of Oxford, England; Dr. J. G. Machen, of Philadelphia; the lamented Robert Dick Wilson; Dr. A. T. Robertson, and a tiresome list of other Christian scholars on both sides of the Atlantic.

If such is his attitude toward the leaders of modern evangelical Christianity, one can easily imagine the delightful sweetness and light with which he speaks of the common rank and file of Bible believers. Fundamentalism, he says, "is an effort to make Christianity and ignorance synonymous terms" (p. 70). He goes on to say that a survey of conditions here in America "would undoubtedly show that fundamentalism is strongest in the denominations where standards for admission to the ministry are lowest." The training camps for ministers, he says, among the Fundamentalists

are not colleges nor theological seminaries. Years ago they gave up all hope of universities, but clung to the fond hope that in church colleges young men might be kept ignorant enough to qualify for the ministry. Still later they thought theological seminaries might send out blind leaders of the blind, if they could be kept under intimidation. But that plan failed because young men sufficiently educated to enter a respectable seminary were too far advanced in education to care to be preachers of ignorance. Now they are herded from the common schools into Bible institutes where zeal takes the place of study, and such knowledge of any subject as their untrained minds meet is so sterilized as to leave ignorance undisturbed (pp. 70, 71).

As an example of sweetness and light, can you beat it?

The general tone of the book is that of intense, implacable hatred of everything connected with old-fashioned Christianity or a belief in

the Bible as a real revelation from a living God to rebellious, sinful men.

Of course, some good things can be said about it. It is well written. And the first part of the book calls deserved attention to the fact that the theories of geology are inseparably connected with the theory of evolution. But Mr. Forrest ought to have been fair enough to recognize that Fundamentalists quite generally have found the weak spot in the theory of evolution, the one tender spot that evolutionists will never permit to be touched, namely, the geological theory of many prolonged successive ages. Perhaps if Professor Forrest has never heard of any books dealing with this side of the question he may be interested to examine "The Geological-Ages Hoax," which has just been issued by Fleming H. Revell Co., New York. By dealing with what informed Fundamentalists really teach along this line, instead of setting up his straw man and knocking it down, Mr. Forrest would have no point at all in his argument through the first part of his book.

And the rest of the book is not any better. It contains all the stale jibes about the four corners of the earth, about the canopy or firmament overarching the earth, about the impossibility of translating an infallible Bible, about Belshazzar's not being the last king of Babylon—

and all the dozens of other quibbles which seem to be the stock in trade of the modern opponents of the Bible, just as they were the stock arguments of Paine and Ingersoll, of Bardlaugh and Bolingbrook and Voltaire, clear back to the days of Porphyry and Celsus. It matters not that Christian apologists have answered all these silly quibbles over and over again; the same mummified sneers are thrown at our heads, until one is compelled to think that the so-called Modernists are the only people who don't know what Christian apologetic literature has produced.

I must not go further in describing this book. I have devoted altogether too much space to it. For in its steady tone of implacable hatred of everything that is in accord with evangelical Christianity, I have not seen its equal since I used to read W. K. Clifford, Robert Blatchford, and Herbert Spencer of a generation ago. But these were outside the Church, as open and undisguised enemies attacking the Church. Forrest and his fellows are within the Church, and openly boast that they intend to stay in the Church and keep boring from within. It remains to be seen whether the churches of America and England will stand quietly by while these mutineers seek to scuttle the ship.—  
*George McCready Price.*

## Reviews of Recent Books

**Consecrated Leadership.** By Amos John Traver. The United Lutheran Publication House, 1228-34 Spruce Street, Philadelphia, Pa. Price, \$1.00.

There are many quotable passages in this big little book—big in purpose and content and helpfulness, even if it is small in size. While the author recognizes the evils of modern youth, he has not become cynical or pessimistic. He says: "There are enough young people who are going bad to keep us from undue optimism. In spite of this, I am satisfied that most of our modern youth are honestly seeking God." A decided merit of Mr. Traver's book is that it does not deal with questions of mere technique, such as equipment, programs and training, but concerns itself with the personality of the leader. If he has force of character and is consecrated to his vocation, he will readily adopt the best methods of doing his vocational work. A prime requisite for the Christian leader is true consecration. He must not merely go "so far," but must "go all the way." He must

realize in a real experience the power of Christ's presence in his heart. The book is written in a sprightly style, and holds attention from beginning to end. Its contents are enriched by many apt incidents and poetical quotations. The Christian leader must not want to be a leader for ambition's sake, but must be like Christ, ever willing to minister to others for their good.

**St. John.** By W. Graham Scroggie, D.D. Harper & Brothers, 49 East 33 Street, New York; 39 Great Russell Street, London. Price, \$1.25.

This book, though small in size, is big in content. Dr. Scroggie is a firm believer in the Johannine authorship of the gospel which bears the apostle's name. In his introduction he indicates the marked differences between the gospel according to John and the Synoptics; yet he shows that they are not contradictory but complementary. He makes a classification of the material in the gospel, and points out that life, light and love are capital words and stand



for primary conceptions. The main part of the book is expository, with many pointed and relevant applications. He often makes his questions quite personal to his readers, and thus drives his arrows right home to the conscience. This book is helpful to all Bible students, and furnishes suggestive material to the preacher for sermons. In our "Additional Literary Notes" you will find some apt tributes to the gospel of John which we borrow from Dr. Scroggie's book.

**The Story of the Uniform Lessons.** By John R. Sampey, Ira M. Price and David R. Piper. David C. Cook Publishing Company, Elgin, Ill. Paper, 10c; cloth, 25c.

Here is a little book that is packed with useful information. It is wonderful how much can be put into a small compass. Dr. Sampey treats of the beginning of the Sunday School movement under Robert Raikes and its subsequent history and development, and then tells the story of the Uniform Lessons. Dr. Price furnishes an interesting chapter on the principles governing the selection of the lessons. Mr. Piper is not behind the others in telling us about the lessons in the light of modern educational theory. He also treats of the practical advantages of the series. The book has been written and published as the result of a widespread demand for such a volume. Well does it fulfill its objective. Everybody who is interested in Sunday School work ought to get it and read it.

**In the Presence.** By Paul Zeller Strodach, D.D. The United Lutheran Publication House, Philadelphia, Pa. Price, \$1.00.

As a help in exercising and cultivating the devotional spirit in the time of Lent, this book may be most highly commended. It consists of prayers and meditations for the quiet hour of remembrance and devotion in the holy Lententide. For each day of Lent, beginning with Ash Wednesday, there are appropriate passages of the Bible, a prayer and a meditation, with frequently a hymn added. Everything in the book is of a deeply devout and spiritual character. Everywhere the gospel of redeeming love and the office work of the Holy Spirit are made the basis of the truly spiritual mind and life.

**Rescue the Perishing.** By Fred R. Seibert. Address the Author, 218 South Wabash Ave., Chicago, Ill. Price, 25c.

The author of this useful booklet is a devoted evangelist who has had much experience in seeking souls and winning them to the Lord Jesus Christ. He indicates how personal work

may be made easy, and gives many valuable suggestions to all who desire to bring the unsaved into the kingdom. The preface says: "This book is the result of a life time of research and practical effort, and has been forged on the anvil of experience." Many passages of Scripture are quoted which are relevant to almost any circumstance and fitted to the needs of all kinds of people. The soul-winner ought by all means to have this serviceable manual in his possession.

**The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.** Translated by Rev. E. E. Cunningham, M.A. Marshall, Morgan & Scott, Ltd., 1,2,11,12 Paternoster Buildings, London, E.C.4. Price, 7s. 6d.

You may depend upon this London firm for bringing out good and worthwhile books. Many of them are of a profound and scholarly character, and all of them, as far as we have seen, confess allegiance to the historic Christian faith. The present volume is a smooth, vernacular English translation of the New Testament from the original Greek text, following the liquid English of the King James version as far as it is correct. Antiquated English words and expressions, however, are displaced by understandable present-day English. The Revised Version of 1881 is put in poor English. Most of the modern translations cannot be trusted on account of the subjective predilections of the authors. This author has made one departure from the Authorized Version that we regret. He has arranged the books of the New Testament in their chronological order instead of in the order to which we are accustomed, and that makes the book a little inconvenient to handle. However, we commend this translation as one that is true to the original text, and yet is written in attractive and intelligible idiomatic English. We have not been able to read the whole book, nor go over it critically, but what we have read here and there has delighted us very much. In the translator's hands, the New Testament is a most engaging book, all the more so when you assimilate its precious and divinely inspired content.

**Familiar Talks with Students of the Greek New Testament.** By Professor Jacob Vander Meulen, A.M., D.D. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 234 Pearl Street, Grand Rapids, Mich. Price, \$2.00.

It may not be on the subject, but when a man dedicates his book to his wife, it is a good sign for both of them. Well, here is just the book for the theological student, the pastor in the field, the preacher of the Word, the theological

professor, the intelligent layman; in brief and in fine, for everybody who wants to know Christ and the New Testament better. What fine chapters are the first two on what is known as the *Koine*, the language in which the New Testament was written! Here is an interesting question, "Did Jesus speak Greek?" Well, it is answered in Chapter II. Then follow a number of enlightening chapters on the distinguishing features of the Greek of the New Testament—those that differentiate it from classical Greek. How suitable for the Holy Spirit's purposes and the needs of humanity is the New Testament Greek, which was the universal vernacular in the days of Christ and His apostles! It was the very language that was found on the papyri some years ago. A chapter on the printed Greek Testament and translations and versions affords much useful information. Especially valuable for faith is the chapter on "The New Testament Canon." Dr. Meulen finds a perfect consistence between portrayals of Christ in the gospels and epistles. Thank the Lord, there is no rationalism in this book, but a lot of sound reasoning.

**Weakness of Evolution.** By W. Maslin Frysinger, D.D. Pentecostal Publishing Company, Louisville, Ky. Price, \$1.00.

Because many excellent books have been published in opposition to the theory of evolution, it must not be thought that Dr. Frysinger has merely repeated what others have said. Indeed, he has added many new facts and adduced many new and cogent arguments. Quoting from many leading scientists who believe in evolution, he shows how contradictory they are and how many fatal concessions they are compelled to make. They even differ in their definitions of evolution. Our author shows effectively that, if even the term "evolution" has no stable meaning, it is a poor term for science; it cannot stand for a view that has been scientifically established. On page 14 he argues that evolution of any kind properly so-called "drives the omnipresent God of theology out of the universe, for it leaves Him nothing to do." This is sound reasoning, because, if at any point the personal God should become active and add something new to the process, that would not be evolution, but creation. No; the theory cannot stand on its legs. Our author reasons that evolution "attempts the impossible," because it is an effort to "bring psychic phenomena within the bounds of physical science." In his fifth chapter he shows, by means of many citations, that the advocates of

evolution are at variance with one another. In another chapter he indicates that the theory is discredited by many scientists. He ends his discussion by answering the salient question, "Why then is evolution popular?" Read the book by all means. Orders filled promptly by publisher CHRISTIAN LIFE AND FAITH.

**Educational Movements of Today.** By Walter Albion Squires, D.D. The Westminster Press, Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa. Price, \$1.25.

No informed and serious-minded person can help feeling grave concern over the situation today in educational circles. Shall education be completely secularized? Or shall religion have a place in the culture of the young? What would be the effect on individuals, society, civilization and mankind in general, if religion should be entirely elided from our public school system, which claims so much of the pupil's time that there is scarcely any time left for religious teaching? We must say that Dr. Squires in this, his most recent book, looks the crucial facts directly in the face, and does not glaze over the seriousness of the situation. He has produced a valuable work—indeed, it is invaluable to the person who wishes to know the salient facts in the world of culture. Dr. Squires never becomes hectic, however earnest he may be; he preserves the judicial poise. By a critical examination of the facts in the case, he draws the conclusion that there are some movements today that indicate a recognition of the need of religion in an all-round education; also of its value to morals and patriotism. On the other hand, there is a movement on the part of educators, not only to monopolize all the pupil's time, but also to ignore the idea of instruction in religion and even to oppose it. There is, in fact, he says, "an anti-religious invasion" in our public schools. Our author points out the peril there is in the teaching of the Freudian psychology and the Dewey philosophy. Here his observations are fair, although they are deservedly poignant. Frankly, Dr. Squires is not satisfied that mere religion should be taught to the young, but argues that the distinctively Christian religion—"the supremacy of Jesus"—should be taught, if not in the public schools, then surely in the schools of the church. For this purpose the state ought to permit ample time and give scholastic credit for work done. A most vital discussion of the relation of the church and the state is contained in this thoroughgoing volume. These two institutions ought not to be combined, but



they should co-operate. It was never the intention of the fathers, the framers of the constitution, that they should be antagonistic. The author does not want to turn prophet, but he does have an important closing chapter on "the national system of education to which we are drifting." We regard this book as of great and timely value. It ought to awaken all Christian people to the tension and even danger that exists today in the educational world. This is no time to sleep or lie back on one's oars and simply drift along.

**The Gospel Minister.** By L. M. Zimmerman, D.D. Hochschild, Kohn & Company, Howard and Lexington Streets, Baltimore, Md. Price, \$1.00.

The author is a Lutheran minister who has been preaching "the gospel of the blessed God" for forty-four years, thirty-eight of which have been spent in the city of Baltimore. Sincerely do we hope that many persons, both lay and clerical, outside of the Lutheran Church will read this uplifting manual. How stimulating is such a sentence as this: "Visions and ideals keep our souls from decrepitude and our minds from decay." Dr. Zimmerman has been a devoted pastor as well as a persuasive preacher. He has neglected neither the pulpit nor the pastoral care. His congregation in Baltimore grew so large numerically under his ministrations that he was accustomed to preach Sunday after Sunday to twenty-two hundred people. His book is divided into two main parts, the first dealing with the minister as Prophet; the second, as Pastor. The sub-titles under these heads—that is, the chapter headings—are so suggestive that we can scarcely refrain from reciting them—but let the reader get the book and see and read for himself. While it is a book especially adapted to the needs of young ministers and seminary students, we feel sure that many other people will find it profitable and uplifting.

**Some Noted Ministers of the Northern Highlands.** By Rev. D. Beaton. Address the Author, Oban, Argyllshire, Scotland. Price, 5s. 4d.

It is indeed a pleasure to recommend sound and helpful books to our clientele of readers. Here is one from bonnie old Scotland which will warm every reader's heart, especially if he is interested in the biography of earnest and self-sacrificing servants of the Lord Jesus Christ. Many of the names of these Highland ministers may be new to the reader, but by reading about them, he will enlarge his field of knowledge,

and will realize that in many places of the earth Christ, in days ago, raised up men who were as unselfish as they were potent in upholding and promulgating His cause and kingdom. Many of these men had to suffer dire persecution from those who were opposed to the Covenanters. But persecution did not induce them to deny their faith. With Pauline courage and zeal they continued to bear their evangelical testimony. Some of the names with which you will become familiar if you read this book are: Thomas Hogg, Thomas Ross, James Fraser (two by the same name), John Robertson, John Kennedy (two), John Macdonald, John Sutherland, Roderick Macleod, Angus Mackintosh, Alexander Stewart (two), Archibald Cook. And with what apostolic power some of these saintly men preached the eternal Word!

**The Pull of the Invisible and Other Addresses.** By J. Stanley Durkee, D.D. Fleming H. Revell Company, 158 Fifth Ave., New York. Price, \$2.00.

Dr. Durkee's new volume, we are informed, consists of "radio chats" delivered over the National Broadcasting Company's nation-wide hook-up, and sponsored by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. Perhaps these auspices will account for the lightness with which the author touches on doctrine. He steps lightly on theology; he strikes the soft pedal gently. You cannot say that there is anything modernistic about these so-called "chats." Perhaps there is to them a background of evangelical doctrine, but that background does not seem to be very tangible and clearly defined. The discourses are filled with pithy sayings. They are intended to cheer and help people to be good and happy along the highway of life; although they do sometimes rebuke sin, especially the sins of smallness, narrowness and low ideals. The initial chapter, which gives the main part of the title to the book, recognizes that the invisible—that is, the spiritual—things are those of the finest and highest value. The title was suggested by the author's reading "in an old book, the author of which nobody knows." He refers to the Letter to the Hebrews, the eleventh chapter, where it is said of Moses, "He endured, as seeing Him who is invisible." Therefore God is clearly recognized as constituting the chief "pull" upon everything that is best in man. We would in general say that the volume consists of bright and cheery talks on how to make life better, enriched by choice quotations in both prose and poetry and enlivened by many apt epigrams.

Look at some of the chapter captions and judge for yourself: "The Man with the Iron Mask;" "Pilate's Washbowl," "Better Try," "Start from a Star," "From Mud to Marble," "Noah's Carpenters," "Increase Your Range." In all your difficulties you may get help from "the Invisible"—that is, from God and Christ and all good forces. A good quotation is the following (p. 152): . . . "a higher must reach down into the lower and absorb the lower if it shall ever get higher in the scale of life or service." Yes, that is the law in both nature and grace.

**Sermons by Noted Ministers of the Northern Highlands.** By Rev. D. Beaton. Address the Author, Oban, Argyllshire, Scotland. Price, 5s. 4d.

This book is just as good in its way as the preceding one is in *its* way. Here is the old-style of preaching. So different is it from much of the modern vogue. It is not made up of witty sayings, pearls of wise epigram, and telling stories and metaphors. No; this old Covenantanter way of preaching was not for the display of man's wisdom, but for the glory of God. It had a real doctrinal basis—the doctrine of the inherent sinfulness of man and the severe penal consequences of sin; the doctrine of salvation by the pure grace of God through faith in Jesus Christ; the doctrine of a blissful future life for all God's elected and believing children. These old-time preachers sometimes plowed deep; they did not skim the surface of thought; they did not indulge in mere pious platitudes. One wonders how they could hold the attention of their audiences with such profound discourse; but the explanation is, that many of their people were versed in the Scriptures and were well posted regarding the fundamental principles of Christian theology. Here is quite a theological sermon by James Fraser on "No Condemnation;" another by Alexander Stewart on "The Everlasting Covenant;" another by John Macdonald on "The Righteousness of God Without the Law," etc.

**Family Prayers.** By Henry B. Hemmeyer, D.D. Concordia Publishing Company, 3558 South Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo. Prices, cloth, 60 cents; leather, \$1.75.

The title of this book indicates its contents—*Family Prayers*. Yet it can be used just as well for one's daily private devotions. Indeed, we note that the first personal pronouns are used throughout the book, showing that the prayers are of a very personal character. The table of contents presents a rich variety. There are

Psalm readings for morning and evening; general morning and evening prayers (*Enchiridion*); grace and thanksgiving at table; morning and evening prayers for every day in the week; special prayers. The special prayers include a lengthy list, among which the following may be mentioned: at the beginning of the New Year; for the new life; for the gifts of the Spirit; for preservation in the true faith; for conformity to the will of Christ; for preparation for death; against a besetting sin; against idle talk; against envy; against sinful thoughts. Thus almost every state and condition of life has here a fitting devotional service. We cannot help feeling that such rich spiritual prayers will develop and enrich the Christian's life. There is no need that these printed prayers should prevent the use of free prayers both for family and private devotions.

**Lives of Great Missionary Women.** By Paul E. Kretzmann. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. Price, 40c.

It is worth saying over again that woman has played an important role in the history of the Christian church, as also in the times of the Old Testament dispensation. Names will readily occur to the student of the Bible and of church history. The fine little book before us is Volume IX of the series entitled *Men and Missions*, edited by Dr. L. Fuerbringer—a series that is of great value and covers a wide field. It is by no means confined to Lutheran missionaries, and therefore will be of interest to all Christians. It certainly is thrilling and inspiring to read the story of the devotion and sacrifices of the missionary women listed in this little book. Here you will learn of the lives of Hannah Marshman, Fidelia Fiske, Isabella Thoburn, Hannah Mullens, Anna Kugler, Ann Hasseltine Judson, and several others. The author recites these biographies in an engaging style, without any conscious effort at fine writing; which, after all, is the finest kind of writing. The reading of such a book will certainly incite Christian people to help in pushing forward the evangelization of the world. Such unselfish devotion to Christ affords the best evidence of the divine character and holy truth of Biblical Christianity.

**Revelation: The Book With a Blessing.** By Samuel F. Hurnard. Morgan, Marshall & Scott, Ltd., 1,2,11,12 Paternoster Building, London; also Edinburgh. Price, 3s. 6d.

While we cannot command the time to give this book a thorough reading, we like the author's mental and spiritual attitude as ex-



pressed in his introductory note: "The volume is the outcome of long and repeated study. . . While touching here and there upon points of scholarship, these pages are intended for the ordinary, but interested, reader. The subject of Revelation is too solemnly urgent in these days for merely dry exposition. It calls for personal application; and the note of exhortation is not absent." This last note is evident in the author's treatment of the letters to the seven churches of Asia, which, he holds, are typical of the church throughout the ages until the end comes. He also says: "Exaggeration is abhorrent to me, and so, too, is anything like unkind reflection upon those holding different views." Two pages are given to presenting a detailed outline of the book of Revelation. This is very suggestive. The author takes the so-called "Futurist" view of Revelation; for, speaking of the seven letters, he says: "Thus there is a primary application to the first-century churches; there is a personal application of surpassing value to all sorts and conditions of Christian experience; and a prophetic outline of Church History." All the messages, seals, visions, signs, trumpets, vials and final judgments are here interpreted in an interesting and profitable way.

**Guinness of Honan.** By Mrs. Howard Taylor. China Inland Mission, 237 West School Lane, Philadelphia, Pa.; 150 St. George Street, Toronto 5, Ontario. Price, \$1.75.

Who is not familiar with the name Guinness? A number of years ago the name of H. Grattan Guinness, D.D., was a household word here in America, as well as in Great Britain and other parts of the world. When Dr. Guinness visited this country, he was received with great favor, and won many souls to Christ by his burning messages. Dr. G. Whitfield Guinness, the subject of the book now under review, was the son of Dr. H. Grattan Guinness. The former was a medical doctor, however, instead of a Doctor of Divinity. He went to Honan, China, and was connected with the China Inland Mission, founded by Hudson Taylor, so well known as a devoted and effective missionary. The author of this book, Mrs. Howard Taylor, is a daughter-in-law of Hudson Taylor, and the sister of Whitfield Guinness, and has written a very interesting and intimate biography of her brother. She tells a most intriguing story in a simple and graphic way that almost reads itself. Many interesting incidents in the life of Dr. and Mrs. Grattan Guinness are told—the life of the family; the development of the children, their removals

from place to place, their experiences in their evangelistic work, their establishment of Harley College in London and its branch at the Cliff House, the university experiences of Whitfield and his call to China. Then the narrative tells the marvellous story of his work in that country, so full of trial and yet so full of joyous consecration. For twenty-seven years he labored there. Always, while attending to his strenuous medical work, he imparted to his patients and others the knowledge of the salvation that Christ wrought for them, so that many were brought to an experiential knowledge of His saving power. Then, on April 12, 1927, a fever that could not be conquered took away his precious life, and his soul took its flight to the celestial country. We can truly say that we have never read a more engaging and spiritually uplifting biography than this one. It is a monument to a worthy man of God and his devoted family. It is a large book of 332 octavo pages, beautifully printed, bound and illustrated, and yet the price is only \$1.75.

**Not in Their Class.** By Rev. Arthur Irdell Ross. Richard Badger, Publisher (The Gorham Press), Boston, Mass. Price, \$2.00. By ordering from the Author, South Vineland, N. J., \$1.75.

And now a story—and a good one, written in a clear and simple style, without any effort at fine rhetoric. A young man who is poor in this world's goods, but who is of good Christian character, goes to a somewhat aristocratic college, where he meets with a good many humiliating snubs from the youthful snobbery; but he does not let himself be daunted, even though his feelings are often hurt. He proves himself a hero, and wins friends even among the *elite*. Really it is quite a "taking" story. We would gladly say more about it, but we do not want to spoil the story for you by telling too much. We like a story which portrays real moral heroism.

## Additional Literary Notes

A recent booklet entitled *The Menace of Atheism*, by William I. Lonergan, is a Roman Catholic publication and upholds some Catholic principles; yet we cannot help commending it as a solid and convincing argument against the atheistic philosophies of the day. It is useful also as an *expose* of the present-day propaganda of atheism, especially of the activities and principles of the Four A's. The numerous quotations from their literature certainly ought to open people's eyes to the dangers of the

cult. There are also many important quotations from great writers who have upheld theism. Many of these quotations are from scientists of the first order. The booklet is published by The American Press, New York, N. Y. Price, 25 cents.

Last November the great and historic Park Street Church, Boston, Mass., celebrated the twenty-fifth anniversary of its beloved pastor, Rev. A. Z. Conrad, Ph.D., D.D., who is well known to many of our readers. A beautifully illustrated souvenir program of the event has been sent to us. It gives an interesting history of the church and recites many other facts that are of general as well as local interest. On this anniversary Dr. Conrad preached a sermon which has been issued in booklet form, the price of which is 10 cents per copy or \$5.00 per hundred. It is entitled *Credo*. In this sermon he tells what he believes after forty-five years in the Christian ministry. You may depend upon it that Dr. Conrad "believes what he believes in." He is not the kind of man who is "tossed about by every wind of doctrine." It certainly is refreshing to read the "Credo" of one who has so stalwart a faith and is able to give such cogent reasons for the hope that is in him.

The writer of these lines has received a cordial letter from Professor John R. Mackay, D. D., of Edinburgh, Scotland, one of the editors of that fine and scholarly magazine, *The Evangelical Quarterly*, edited in Edinburgh and published by James Clarke & Company, 9 Essex Street, London, W. C. 2. It may also be ordered from W. F. Henderson, George-IV Bridge, Edinburgh. Price in English money 2s. 9d. Dr. Mackay writes:

"I should have written to thank you warmly for the splendid contribution you made to the April, 1930, number of the *Evangelical Quarterly*. I do also feel indebted to you for your reference — always so kind — to our several numbers. I note with interest that your own magazine will henceforth be known as CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE. More strength to you!"

We certainly thank Dr. Mackay for his good words, and wish again to call attention to the valuable periodical with which he is connected. It is just what it professes to be: "A Theological Review, International in Scope and Outlook, in Defense of the Historic Christian Faith." It publishes a good many articles by American scholars. Among those Americans whose contributions have already appeared are

Drs. Melvin S. Keyle, Pittsburgh-Xenia Seminary, George Johnson, Lincoln University, C. Van Til, Westminster Seminary, and Thomas C. Johnson, Union Theological Seminary (Richmond, Va.). The magazine also cites many important articles that appear in American theological magazines.

The address of our great American theological quarterly, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, is changed from St. Louis, Mo., to 616 North Ave., West, Pittsburgh, Pa. The prices are 75 cents the single number; yearly subscription, \$3.00. It contains many valuable articles and book reviews. An article by Dr. John McNaugher, President of Pittsburgh-Xenia Seminary, entitled "The Son of Man," is a most refreshing study of the person and incarnation of the Son of God. The literary editors of the magazine are Drs. Kyle and Webster. Dr. McCreary is the managing editor, and Dr. Kelso the review editor.

What is a point? What is a line? What is a surface? Can a line and a surface really be distinguished from each other? What is their relation to a body? Well, if you want to delve into these questions in a deep and philosophical way, and do some real thinking, get and read William of Ockham's *De Sacramento Altaris*, translated from the Latin into the English by Professor T. Bruce Birch and noticed in one of the foregoing reviews. Then go further, and trace the discussion of points, lines, surfaces and substances to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. In this way you will get into the depths of both philosophy and theology.

A scholarly reviewer agrees with our verdict on Professor E. Hove's excellent theological treatise on *Christian Doctrine*, which was reviewed in the January number of this journal, page 48. He quotes Dr. Hove as saying to him some years ago: "Some people think Dogmatics is a very dry, uninteresting subject. They are mistaken, and their mistake arises from the fact that they have never tried to go thoroughly into some of the great doctrinal truths of the Christian faith. If they did, they would find it more interesting than any other subject." As a rule, those persons who treat theology in a cavalier fashion prove, by the very language they use, that they have never studied it deeply, and therefore have wrong and one-sided conceptions of its principles and purpose.



## Our Serial--The Clamping of the Shackles

*A story that deals effectively with some of the crucial questions that are now disrupting the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ*

—BY PROFESSOR GLENN GATES COLE, LITT.D.—

AND so, propped up on her cushions, with an arm of Mrs. Donald about her, Otie Nelson unburdened her soul's secret to Peyton.

"I could not help it. I loved Guy so. I know now it was wrong to take him away from Stella and little Fairy; but he loved me, and suggested the step, himself. I did not realize how evil it was at the time. According to our plan, I went to Cleveland for a week, then to Pittsburgh to meet him. He went to Cincinnati to divert suspicion, and then came to join me at Pittsburgh. I stayed at a hotel until I got a letter from him, stating that he would join me at the B. and O. station that night or in the morning. He could not tell me definitely which. I left the hotel and went to the station that evening, so as not to miss him. I sat in the waiting-room all night; and in the early morning, he came. We took the train for Washington at once. It was all a bright wedding-trip to me, although we were not married—yet." Here she paused, and gazed thoughtfully at the band of gold on her wedding-finger for an instant. Then, she looked up.

"But we are married, now, Mr. Harker. I want you to know that."

"Yes; I know it," he assured her.

"And then, in my happiness, I discovered that he was worried about something. For a week, he bought every Pittsburgh paper he could find, and searched them keenly for news. Evidently, he did not find what he was looking for, and it disconcerted him. I tried to have him confide the secret to me, but he refused.

"He grew very petulant at my frequent references to his secret; and then, one day, when I was most insistent, he became angered, and struck me. It was a powerful blow, but the

### XXVIII

#### *Peyton is Delivered from the Shackles*

*"Nothing would be worse for you than to continue your work if you feel unworthy of it. It might be a good thing for you to go to India, and visit a few mission-stations. There you would find a few worse Pagans than yourself cleansed by the forgiveness of our Christ, and without hypocrisy, engaged in doing a work they are less qualified for than yourself."*

cruelty of it was the worst, and it almost crushed me. I loved him so; and it—it awakened me from my foolish happiness. With remorse, I locked myself in my room, and would not see him for days. Finally, weak and half-starved, I opened the door to him. He was very penitent. He asked for my forgiveness; and to get it, he confessed the crime.

"He told me about his arrival at Pittsburgh on the morning train. He came in at the Union Station or the Pennsylvania Station, as it is called. I was waiting for him

at the B. and O. Station. Although he expected no pursuit or apprehension, his guilty mind would take no risks, so he decided not to go through the waiting-room, but to follow the covered pavement outside the building, to the taxi-stands. Once started down this pavement, there was no chance to hide. Here he came upon Wanda Reese. He was almost against her before he recognized who it was. Instantly, his imagined danger robbed him of reason. He forgot that she was one of the best friends he ever had. He followed a wild impulse to strike her down before she recognized him. She was turning towards him. In his fright, he struck a terrific blow. In falling, her head struck the wall,—her neck twisted, as though broken. She lay apparently—apparently dead upon the pavement, and he fled.

"Reaching the taxi-stand, he was too frightened to secure one, and fled on through the early morning streets to my station. In the meeting, for the moment, he forgot his danger. Then, he hurried me aboard the train, and once on our way, he became assured of his escape. He could find no news of the murder in the Pittsburgh papers, but realized that his apprehension might come sooner or later.



"His confession was more than I could bear. I do not remember what I did. I do know I was very ill, and after a while became conscious of the presence of Mrs. Donald. She has been very good to me. Other than that, I do not remember very much—except—except I am married now, Mr. Harker."

She sank back upon her couch again, and closed her eyes. Peyton left her thus, and shortly after took his leave of Mrs. Donald, securing a promise from her to write him frequently appraising him of Otie's condition.

"I think she will be much easier, now," he said. "No doubt that the fear of Miss Reese's murder was her greatest source of sorrow. If so, she may get better."

"We shall hope so, anyway," confirmed Mrs. Donald.

That evening, Peyton took a train for Washington, and the next day arrived at Pittsburgh.

He had telegraphed Lieutenant Doyle to meet him for a conference in the few minutes between trains. He briefly, but fully laid his discoveries before him. It was not fitting for him to suppress crime.

"That clue amazes me beyond measure," the officer informed him. "In fact, I had all but cinched the affair on a fellow named Dan Wise, who is working in the shops at Cumberland. I have had a detective chumming with him for weeks now; and was expecting a confession any time. I'll get this Mason, now!"

"Sometimes, Mr. Doyle, people become so related to important affairs that it is injustice to follow them up with the punishment for minor crimes committed long before. You know the law recognizes this truth in arrangements for what is called 'Statute limitations?' Now, I request that we look upon this accident in some such light. I am a law-abiding citizen, and would not have a part in a real felony; but why not let the matter rest until you have word from Miss Reese herself? She was the one who suffered."

The Lieutenant thought a moment. "I am not so sure about that," he confided. "My feelings are that I ought to get that man. We can never stamp out crime by sentimentally allowing criminals to go free. I think I know what Miss Reese would advise, and in one way, she ought to have her way, for it was she who suffered from it. But I must have some other argument, if you have one."

"I have it," replied Peyton, admiring the firm stand of this minion of the law. "Mrs. Mason is on the verge of insanity over the

matter, and I fear for her life if she finds herself married to a penitentiary convict."

"That is not an argument," said the officer, laughing softly. "Instead, it is only some more sentiment."

"Well, I'm done," confessed Peyton. "Do as you think best."

The officer looked disappointed. "Really, Mr. Harker, I did hope you could convince me, for I wanted to be convinced. Since the girl is where she is, I want her to have the easiest life possible. It is too late to save her, but I do hate to make her suffer more."

Peyton's eyes twinkled as he replied, "Suppose then, you think up some good reason other than sentiment to forget about this accident. Think something real strong and convincing that will ease your conscience in the matter."

"I'll hear what Miss Reese has to say first, anyway," he agreed. "If she does not offer a dozen very good ones, I miss my guess."

The next day, Peyton was domiciled again at his old quarters in Warburton. The janitor had kept the rooms cleaned and dusted, and as he had kept his rent paid, he took possession as one coming back from a short week's absence. A large package resting on the floor in one corner, caught his eye. It proved to be an express package, and addressed to him. He rang for the janitor.

After the usual greetings and formalities had been exchanged, Peyton asked the janitor about the package. But it merely appeared to have come by express a few days before, prepaid. Expecting him home, he had placed it there to await his coming. Peyton went to the bookshelves while the janitor watched the move, appraisingly. In a moment, Harker thrust an armful he had drawn from the shelves into the arms of the amazed man.

"Take these to the basement, and use them for kindling the furnace," he ordered.

"But, Mr. Harker," expostulated the man.

Harker laughed, and added two more to the man's burden. "Come back at once for another load," he commanded.

Harker caught a strange questioning look upon the perplexed janitor's face. "He thinks I'm crazy," said Peyton, as the man left. "And perhaps I am. But to me just now, it seems like getting rid of shackles and straight-jackets. I'll soon have room to draw a free breath!"

Having disposed of a hundred or more of the more radical volumes, he temporarily called a halt. He would sort out the rest later. The janitor departed and he was left alone. He pounced upon the mysterious package. In a



trice it was opened and fifty attractive, new, well-bound books were before him.

With a wondering interest, he examined the titles, and burst into a happy laugh.

"Wanda's work!" he exclaimed. "I might have guessed it. She has made a marvelous selection," he continued, as he glanced at volume after volume. "And I have the shelves all ready for your reception," he said.

There were twenty he had never heard of, bearing on their title pages high-ranking Ph.D. authorities in great universities. They were men renowned in biological, philosophical, and scientific circles. He was aware for the first time that the anti-evolutionary authorities were no whit beneath those he had been falsely assured were the exponents of the only rational side worth considering. There was not a single one of them that he had ever read, and until the last few weeks he had never heard of any of them. It was a surprise to him to find the large number of scholarly treatises that had been issued on the other side of the critical and evolutionary question. From what he had learned recently, he saw that even his own discrimination could have made no better selection. He promised himself many hours of delightful reading in the days that were to come, before his two-year leave of absence should expire.

His duties to his friends soon sent him forth into the street. He called on many of his old-time admirers, and after a time found himself in the neighborhood of Mrs. Mason. Curiosity as to the present attitude of the woman towards her husband and the victim of her untimely gossip, Wanda Reese, led him to ring her bell.

Stella was effusive in her greeting of her former pastor. He got the impression that it was not entirely due to his original relationship that she welcomed him so warmly. They had always been very choice friends in the time when, as the wife of one of his most loyal officers, they frequently had been thrown together. His great perplexity had been how a man could desert a woman of her good qualities, perfection of beauty, and exceptional intelligence. Evidently, Stella's desertion had left no deep scars, for she was surprisingly happy-hearted and vivacious. She was one of those rare creatures that wasted no useless worry on the unavoidable vicissitudes of life, and quickly recovered from every disappointment. His hour spent with her this day, proved an exceptionally merry and happy one.

Little Fairy was now at an age that she could form very decided likes and dislikes for

those she met. She took an exceptional liking to Peyton, much to his satisfaction and the amusement of her mother. While he did not question the woman concerning her desertion and divorce, Stella volunteered much information in an indirect manner. He learned that she knew nothing of the romantic attachment of Otie, nor their marriage. In her anger and hurt at her husband's disaffection, she had lost no time in securing her freedom through the courts. In fact she appeared to have an impression that he had deserted her merely through pique at her unusual attachment to the child and her coolness towards him. So Peyton volunteered her no enlightenment concerning what he knew.

There was one question which she asked, that drew a smile of amusement to Harker's face. It was as to his present attitude on the question of divorce; whether he still held that the Bible teaching was inferior to the legal practice. He answered that he had reversed his attitude from that of the sermon he had once preached on that subject. Her face clouded, as with disappointment.

"Then you think that it would be wrong for me to marry again, even though divorced by law, so long as Guy lives?"

He explained his views as to the absolute affirmative to the question; but he discovered that she was not convinced. It gave him another jolt, for he realized that it was not going to be an easy matter to undo the erroneous teachings of his previous thoughtless days. In fact, would it ever be possible to undo any of the evils he had set loose in the world? The revilement of his teachings by Mrs. Donald, and the effects as reflected in the poor insane eyes of Otie Mason, caused a deep depression to settle upon him. And now, as he left the Mason home, the sunny leave-taking of Fairy and the questioning discontent in Stella's eyes gave him a twinge of conscience that followed him.

He realized that he would never be able to right the wrongs he had done, and he yielded to his discouragement. He must quit the ministry! Never would he be conscience-free concerning his teachings in the future. He had already made a multitude of mistakes; what if he should unwittingly add to them?

In this attitude of mind, his feelings reached out to Wanda. If there was any one who could advise him in this attitude, it would be she. He bent his steps to the Reese home, and found Wanda apparently expecting and waiting for him.



"I thought you would be back in Warburton today," she assured him, as soon as the formal greetings which were all she would submit to, were over.

"Are you glad to see me, Wanda dear?" he asked.

She colored beautifully, and there was a love-light in her eyes, that appeared to melt the screen of reserve as by a powerful flame. But she mastered her feelings, and chided,

"Please, Mr. Harker, do not use that familiar word in speaking to me."

"But, Wanda," he remonstrated. "You know our olden familiar standing, you know my love for you, and surely you have not forgotten that you are to give me an affirmative answer to a certain deferred decision at this time. Are you ready to say 'Yes,' today?"

Again, she colored, and her eyes fell. Then, with a mischievous disregard for his insistence, she looked up with a smile.

"Has that package of books come yet?" she asked.

He allowed her to thus divert him. "Yes, Wanda, I found them awaiting me, and I have replaced them on the shelves in place of some I sent away with the janitor for firing the furnace."

She rippled with mirth. "Really, Mr. Harker, you waste no time when you take a stand for anything."

"Why should I? Is it not useless to procrastinate? I have been mistaken many times in my life, but no one can accuse me of failing to decide and show my position. Now, dear, why do you procrastinate? It is a dangerous practice."

She evaded the personal appeal. "And are you going to come back to the Warburton church as soon as your two year's vacation ends?" she asked.

"No, Wanda, I shall never preach another sermon," he replied with his discouragement creeping into his voice.

She arose and came to him, and without restraint placed a tender hand upon his shoulder.

"Oh, Peyton," she said, with tear-bedewed eyes, "And when I was so happy that you were to become such a towering power for good, and righteousness, and Christ. Tell me, honestly, Peyton, why do you take such an unreasonable attitude?"

"Wanda, I can never get free from my past," he assured her. "I can never free myself from the sins I am guilty of. I can never have an ounce of strength to advocate anything when I remember that it was my false teachings that

put Otie Nelson and Guy Mason where they are, and that cast the shadow into John Lewis's life. And, Wanda dear, I saw little Fairy Mason today. She is a beautiful and sunny creature. What am I to say in justification, when she shall be old enough to accuse me of orphaning her, and revile me for stigmatizing her in the eyes of the world as a divorcee's child?"

"Hush, Peyton!" the girl commanded, severely. "You are making it entirely too enormous. You are bad enough, but do not overdo it. I suppose it is natural for you to feel that way. Remorse and repentance are sure to come over any wrong action."

"I think remorse is the right word, Wanda," he continued. "And I feel it. I am wild with remorse. I can never preach another sermon."

"But you must, Peyton!" the girl exclaimed, earnestly. "It is your duty. No one who has the personality and gifts that you have, can ever refuse to consecrate those talents to the greatest good. I decide, sir, you must preach; and preach the truth!"

"Your decision is final?" he inquired.

"Yes; and is my decision not wise?" she replied.

"I do not know," he said, reflectively. "I cannot judge. But is it your wisdom that I should hypocritically continue on my course of work?"

"Not hypocritically," she insisted. "If you feel that way, you better rest a year. Nothing would be worse than for you to continue your work if you feel unworthy of it. It might be a good thing for you to go to India, and visit a few mission stations. There you might find a few worse Pagans than yourself, cleansed by the forgiveness of our Christ, and without hypocrisy, engaged in doing a work that they are less qualified for than yourself."

"What kind of woman, are you, Wanda?" he asked. "I hardly know how much of what you say is reasonable; and how much is nonsense, or pure jest!"

"That is for you to decide," she said laughing. "I am not going to label it. But, honestly, Peyton, has not your experience showed you that often the most depraved sinner makes the most earnest soul-winner when once reformed?"

"I have observed that fact," he agreed.

"And do you realize despite the awful results of your past teachings, that you will know how best to combat the evils that arise from the critical and evolutionary emasculations of the Gospel? Peyton Harker, God calls men to do His work in particular fields today as sure as He ever did. And you are one called to assume



your responsibility in a day of wavering faith like this!"

There was a fire of zealous earnestness in her voice and her hand fell with electric persuasiveness upon his forehead, as of one anointing to a sacred office.

"Your words hearten me, Wanda!" he exclaimed. "I do believe you are right. If you say so, I'll put my hand to the plough at once, and never look back so long as God gives me power and reason!"

"Thank you, Peyton, I am so glad!" she said, impulsively.

"But, Wanda, do you not see what a tower of strength and inspiration you are to me? How, that in spite of myself, you can lift me from the very depths of selfish discouragement to the mountain-top of zealous fervor? Can you not see, dear, that I need you?"

She slipped away from his extended arms, and flung defiance at him over her shoulder.

"Peyton, you will never reach the plane of success, if you rely upon such weak influences and encouragements as I can wield. I see that you are still wedded to the human restrictions of life. You will need a higher power than any I can give, to make you what you must become. I can never lift you up; for my past will arise instead, to drag you down. I have explained this to you before; and we will not return to it."

She stood, reflectively, over against him; and he perceived in her attitude and thoughtfulness that she was about to give him one of her valuable admonitions: so he waited, anxiously. Finally, she looked up again, and commenced:

"You have promised me this day that you will assume the position of influence in the world to which you are entitled. You must not let those thoughts of me, stand in your way. You are trifling with lower things when the great and surpassing possibilities are beckoning you to follow. But you are human, and you must have the best of influences on the human plane to support you in the spiritual. It is right, Peyton, for you to marry; and I know whom you should marry, were it not for one thing which stands in the way. But you must get free from the illusion that I must marry you. That would be the worst thing that could happen you. Sometime, you will appreciate what I say. Do not blind yourself against your own best interests."

"But you love me," he insisted.

"I am not going to deny nor confirm that statement," she continued. "What I feel, is

but a small matter in the light of what is best for you."

"You have talked that way before," he said, wearily. "And I have refused to agree. But I am beginning to realize that I am up against an immovable, stubborn will. Still, Wanda, I am not going to give up. I am going to give you another chance to decide, but shall wait until I have shown that I am going to make good. Your heart shall speak again, some time. Perhaps, then you will yield."

"Perhaps!" she said, with a smile. "But I do not think I shall."

\* \* \*

## Begining with a Box of Chocolates

It is a great mistake ever to hold oneself up as an example. There is a sort of sincere self-righteousness on the part of some saints that seems to be the result of comparing their spiritual attainments with those of fellow Christians who "have not gone all the way." Job's confidence in his own integrity was chiefly the result of comparing his record with those of his friends. It was the wrong standard of measurement. But when Job got a vision of God in His infinite holiness then Job abhorred himself, and repented in dust and ashes. Dr. Gregory Mantle says that after he had preached a sermon bringing out such truths, a man came to him and said that he could not thank the speaker enough for the message. He said something like this: "You have helped me to-night to catch something of the vision of the holiness of God as Job did. I am a self-righteous Christian. I have for years been holding myself up to my wife as a pattern in the Christian life, insisting that she ought to try to catch up with me, so that we could go along together in a deeper fellowship in our Christian home. But now I see my mistake, and I am going straight home, buy a box of chocolates for my wife, confess to her the mistake I have been making, and try henceforth to live only the life that is Christ." "And when a man gets this vision," said Dr. Mantle, "and decides to cast off his own righteousness as filthy rags and substitute for it Christ's righteousness, I don't know any better way to begin than with a box of chocolates."—*S. S. Times.*

\* \* \*

Beware of the man who discredits the Bible, however pious he may otherwise seem to be.  
—*Southern Methodist.*